

A STUDY IN THE INTERPRETATION OF
PUNCTUATION IN THE
FIRST FOLIO OF SHAKESPEARE

By
EDITH STONE BRIDE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY MEMBERS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
April, 1937

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are again due to the three members of my advisory committee who, despite the untimely experience of having come on through one degree, were kind enough to consent to stay by me through another. Professor Louis Gross, Professor Robert A. Sprou, and Professor Edward L. Thorstein. To these persons, Professor Gross¹ in particular, of the successive drafts of this dissertation and their care to expunge from them anything unbecoming to a candidate for scholarly honors is due my such virtue which it now possesses. Any indiscretions and any errors that remain are my own.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
<u>Thanks:</u>	1
1. A Group at the Pennsylvania University	4
2. The House Calendar of the First Folio of Shakespeare	21
CHAPTER	
I. A GROUP OF THE PRODUCTION VARIANTS IN THE KINGS COLLECTION	21
II. THE FIRST-CLASS'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PRODUCTION: A COMPARISON OF THE TWO KINDS OF PRODUCTION VARIANTS IN PLAYS AND FROM MANUSCRIPT	40
III. COMPARISON'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PRODUCTION: A STUDY OF THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE TENDENCY OF QUOTE (NOT BY TWO COMPARISONS IN THE SYSTEM OF <u>MANUSCRIPT</u>)	62
IV. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMPARISON AND FIRST-CLASS PRODUCTION IN SPECIAL PHASES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE KINGS VARIANTS WITH QUOTE OUT OF OTHER CLASS PHASES SET UPON OR BASED FROM QUOTE	81
CONCLUSION	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	104
APPENDIX	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Changes from Incorporated States to Incorporated States Summary Table	35
2 Table page 443(10)	46
3 Table page 443(11).	47
4 Table page 443(12).	48
5 Table page 443(13)	49
6 Table page 443(14).	50
7 Table page 443(15).	51
8 Table page 443(16)	52
9 Section of Cases with Parentheses Changes in Total Number of Cases on Pages Set by 2 and 3	73
10 Section of Cases of Creation, of Addition, and of Alteration to Total Number of Parentheses Changes on Pages Set by 2 and 3	74
11 Constitutional Institutions.	75
12 Constitutional Economy	76

INTRODUCTION

Preface

My interest in the meaning of handwriting particular began in the course of abstracting a new reading of Wilson's Calligraphy which necessitated the recognition of certain fall steps in the pen as non-syntactic.¹ As I pointed out in that study, the main images of misreading and miswriting coming about when a given mark of punctuation obviously has nothing to do with syntactical work do not then to be discarded as printer's error--that when a syntactical function is attributed to it which obscures the true syntax.²

When punctuation is not too different from what we expect, then, in other words, it does not seem to be confused with the syntactical structure, we hardly notice it. When it does, we must assume either that it is the result of inadvertence or that it is in accord with a system of convention unfamiliar to us, or that it was put there to call attention to something not otherwise possible. The kind of writing one may assume a given step to have depends somewhat on what one expects to have put it there. If the printer did so intentionally, then the writing is necessarily something which is relevant to the work; if it is something accidental, as, for example, in the case of a penon in a theorist's speech, its origin must necessarily be neglected.

¹In Study in Wilson's Handwriting,² unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, 1950.

²An interesting case of this kind is the misreading of a comma and the miswriting of a semicolon in draft with in my note in The Calligrapher of February, 1952 (Vol. XIII, No. 2, page 41).

The Shakespeare texts, as well as others of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, abound in punctuation of doubtful significance, and the temptation to read the punctuation is mixed with the assumption that it is of authorial origin is obvious, especially in the interpretation of difficult passages. Many critics have yielded to this temptation; others have claimed nearly the opposite, that the printer took punctuation entirely into their own hands. Of those who believed that the punctuation was the printer's, some have heaped abuse upon them for bunglers, and others have believed them to be unconsciously following a system laid to mislead. Sometimes the system was held to be profitable, albeit one which acknowledged errors by different conventions from ours; sometimes it was called "rhythmic," sometimes "harmonic."

Since the usual rationale for a phase of non-systematic punctuation is based up with authorial intention, the advocates of, for example, dramatic punctuation have often drawn false inclusions from assumptions about whether a phase of punctuation originated with Shakespeare or with his printers or into a position where they seemed to rely on the untenable assumption that the printed text that has come down to us is identical with Shakespeare's holograph.

It is obvious that before we can attempt to interpret the meaning of a particular mark of punctuation in a Shakespeare text we must be able to agree with what degree of probability we may regard it as Shakespeare's. We must consider what the probability is that it might have been made by a scribe, a compositor, or a proof-reader.

The punctuation controversy has until now focused upon the

First Folio. It is therefore both fitting and fortunate that, because of Dr. Wilson's work in collating the first and second stages of the Folio,¹ it is now possible to study with a great degree of certainty the proof-reader's part in the production of the First Folio. In fact, we have almost exactly how many words of punctuation the proof-reader was responsible for. Allowing for a certain small percentage of misrecognition, we can safely say about ninety. However, although it has often been assumed that it was the proof-reader's intention to restore copy, the new evidence tends to show that the proof-reader did not ordinarily even consult copy. He can be general enough, therefore, that the proof-reader's punctuation is his own idea.

If we study the ninety changes, then, we should get an inkling of what his ideas about punctuation were. Is he following a systematic system? Or a non-systematic system? Is one the changes beyond understanding?

As for the compositions, we would like to know how often they are produced copy punctuation and how often they supplied their own, and, in the latter case, whether they followed the proof-reader's bias or had such a private bias of his own.

We do now know with much certainty what the copy was which the compositor set from for most of the plays in the Folio, but the Hamlet and Julius 1609 Quarto is almost certainly the copy for the Folio. Dr. Wilson has identified the two compositors who set it. We shall therefore take advantage of this information to study the compositors' attitudes

¹Charles Wilson, The Printing and Proof-reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare (2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933).

humble copy production, that is, whether they follow it with absolute fidelity or not, and, if they do not, whether or not they differ from each other in their departures from copy.

However, in those plays where the Quartos from which they are thought to be set are extant, we shall find the Quartos reading and compare it with the two states of the Folio given by Blount. We shall then be able to compare the compositor's treatment of punctuation with that of the proof-reader.

This is only a preliminary study of the nature of the punctuation in the Shakespeare texts. But it is hoped that it will be a first step in the process of eliminating successive layers of accretion, that we can one day say this comma is not the proof-reader's, and likely not the compositor's, unlikely to be the author's, and therefore, it is probably Shakespeare's.

Whatever conclusions we possible in this study are possible only because of Dr. Blount's work, but before we begin we shall take survey of the state in which the discussion of Elizabethan punctuation has been for the last half century.

Part I

A Survey of the Punctuation Controversy

In 1881, in the presence of the punctuation controversy, Justice A. F. Van Dine wrote in an essay called "High-Banded Boys of Elizabethan and Jacobean Punctuation":

If . . . we attempt to trace the sources that must have led to these alterations of the text, we find that our group of

mistakes may be not down to inadvertence or negligence; that a second group believes all attempts at explanation, the changes being apparently dictated by sheer caprice; and that the third group can be accounted for by guessing a desire to correct the text after a fashion.¹

A given folio then, according to the law, might seem nothing at all. It might be Shakespeare's or a host of imitations, parody, or polemic.

From this prevailing harsh view of authors across the editorial attitude is saved with it.

. . . our punctuation is very little dependent upon the Folios and Quartos, but generally follows the practice which has taken possession of the text of Shakespeare, under the arrangement of the best editors, from Page to Ford and Hammon.²

In 1903 Percy Shapton took issue with this point of view in a work entitled Shakespearean Punctuation.³ Shapton's chief concern was to do away with the First Folio.

The punctuation, which is usually reported on the weakest point in the printing of the Folios, I believe to be sound and reasonable. It will help to a higher appreciation of the merits of this famous text if the claim to be regarded as correct [F] in an elementary point of typography can be conclusively established. I have attempted to sketch the evidence, and I venture to submit the cause to the judgment of scholars. Are there, or was there not, a system of punctuation which the old printers used?⁴

¹In Shakespeare as Edited, Printed, Transcribed, and Transpositioned (1900-1901) by Arthur A. F. Van Dine and Coraella Marcella (Anglicanae Punctuatione) Book 5, Heidelberg, 1901, p. 4.

²Twentieth Shakespeare (1903), Preface, 102.

³Percy Shapton, Shakespearean Punctuation (Oxford, 1903).

⁴Shapton, p. 11.

In pointing out certain ordinary Elliptical sentences he is both reasonable and eloquent. The section on comma contains an explanation of right stoppings:

Sentences which we should not partition off by commas or colons or keep apart with the barrier of a full stop, were connected by commas if there was a connecting link in the thought. We have not punctuated our sentences according to grammatical form; the old system was largely guided by meaning.¹

Therefore follow examples of the use of the relative followed by but not preceded by a comma, relative without comma, imperative without comma, appositional phrases without comma, comma marking a rhetorical pause, the separating comma (an example given is "Myself, the son of the brave dark ones to be,"), the comma equivalent to a modern dash (which is, by the way, one of the few modernizations Professor Emerson provides himself in his edition of Bulfinch),² comma marking adverbial phrases, comma between connectives and clauses, between objectives and complements, before a noun clause ("Thus, that we have divided in these our Kingdoms"), etc. There are also sections on the colon, the semicolon, and the full stop; the descriptions of these uses are accurate and clear, as well as a few chapters on other marks like the rhetorical hyphen.

We close up by saying:

Can the differences of this system be classified, and proved step by step by an accumulation of instances? If so, we must do Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount and

¹Blount, p. 34.

²The Fourth Series of Thomas Bulfinch, Cambridge, 1833, I, viii, note 3.

their voices the justice to believe that they have lost in print.¹

On the other hand, Simpson seems to depart from the point of view in which he demonstrated belief in a certain system of punctuation which the old printers used in those sections in which he attributed the printer often to the most subtle editorial intention. For example:

Where punctuation is uniform the old punctuation was quite the reverse. It was natural that in the earlier stages of printing usage should be less settled, and it was constantly corrected by the printer. For the most it was something more: a flexible system of punctuation contrived to express subtle differences of tone. A comparison of the two following passages is suggestive.

How is a woman, therefore may be we'd,
How is a woman, therefore may be wean,
How is Lavinia, therefore must be we'd,
(*Times Indemnities*, II, 1.31-4)

[Ed.] How's beautifully and therefore to be wean'd;
How is a woman; therefore to be wean'd.
(*Sherry VI*, Pt. I, V, 151, 155-6)

The justification for either selecting is given below (pp. 15-17 and see, II, 31)² but there is here more than a superficial change. The poet's intention--for this too was an important variation of the printer--has used even these trivial details to indicate a spiritual difference. *How's* tells, who has just captured Margaret of Anjou, talks parenthetically in love with her at once; he speaks in troubled sadness, and he follows this very reflection with the thought that he has a wife already, and that Margaret is the girl to be his partner. In the end he weans [sic] and wins her for the King. The direct and broken speech indicates the

¹Simpson, p. 28.

²Sp. 15-17 deal with right stopping in general, and, in particular, with passages which "illustrate the almost inevitable use of the comma where the connection of thought is emphasized by parallel clauses or related words"; see, 26 and 28 deal with the distinction between union and indissoluble.

conflict in his mind. But in the other passage mentioned, Hamlet with lost and nerveless, but intense efficiency to seize Laertes, and the confident, unhesitating note in his keeping with his character and situation.¹

The main weakness of Haysen's work in this failure to consider the question whether the punctuation of the First Folio was Shakespeare's or the printers', and to leave his date the inconsistency of coming to agree from one passage at one time and from the other at another.

Haysen's book had many detractors and many supporters, but for many years neither the detractors nor the support took any clear logical line. One of the reasons that so little progress was made was that there seemed to be little awareness of the need to keep separate the question "Are any Shakespeare's autograph manuscripts actually in place historical fact punctuation?" from "Is there a system of punctuation unknown to us that he knew and approved?" and back from "Did he share this knowledge with his scribes or with the compositor or with the proof-reader?"

Among Haysen's influential supporters were A. W. Pollard and John Dover Wilson, who, in his preface to The Tempest, refers to the "Hypothesis originally made by Mr. Henry Haysen" that "The stage in the Folio and Quarto are 'playhouse punctuation, directing the actors how to speak their lines.'² It was around this somewhat vague claim that the most important lines of opposition may be said to have come to focus in the next decade.

Raymond Macdonald Alden launched the attack in ELP, of September, 1926.

¹Haysen, p. 26.

²See Introduction Shakespeare (CHS), p. xciv.

1721, in "The Production of Shakespeare's Tragedies."¹ He takes leave of Wilson in such far the previously quoted passage and the use of the word "discovery"; he would call Mr. Simpson's idea merely a hypothesis. Furthermore:

Mr. Simpson claimed that he had shown such more reticently in the old manuscript than had hitherto been admitted, but did not even approach the matter of "play-house punctuation" or the question how actors should speak their lines. Yet, Mr. Wilson leaps with extraordinary agility to these satisfying conclusions: "In short we believe that we have now Shakespeare wrote; we have a definite clue to his system of punctuation; we feel confident that often nothing but a more positive stance between us and the original manuscript; we sit at home even away into the compositor's shop and catch glimpses of the manuscript through his eyes." It can only be the genuine sense of confidence depicted in those sentences which leave Mr. Wilson, in the hour of Punctuation Doubtlessly preceding the text of the play, to make such statements as the following: "The pauses, especially with the recitation, the action on the period, often tends filling by, a sob, a line, or by other and lengthier 'various'".²

After quoting some to the like effect from Henry Wilson, Alden goes on:

In view of no doubtless a collection of the historical and descriptive evidence as to have revealed, I submit that it is going time to punctuate with more care the ways by which this group of scholars has been led to their new view of the subject. . . . If we are to push, or think we have found, evidence that Elizabethan punctuation was fairly systematic and accurate, it is clearly important to know whether we are chiefly concerned with manuscript habits, followed with accuracy by printers, or with the normalizing accuracy of the printers themselves.³

¹Idem, Vol. XXII, p. 107.

²Idem, pp. 110-11.

³Idem, p. 111. Although Alden does not mention it, an excellent opportunity to study the relationship between manuscript and print had just been magnificently aided by no less a textual critic than Sir Walter Scott himself, as in it comes in a paper to *Murray*, September, 1771, entitled "An Elizabethan Printer and His Copy," in which the manuscript of

Thus, in addition to changing River Wilson with lack of clarity for the fallacy in their plainly whether he is talking about Shakespeare's punctuation or that of the printers, Allen further changes him and "the group," as he calls River Wilson's followers, with inconsistency in their stand on Ellsworth's punctuation in general. Allen suggests that the group ought to consult themselves about whether or not they believe there was a preferred method of punctuation from which the various other methods used by the printers are departures, whether the departures from that method "which our fathers were standard" may be regarded as innovations or whether one is to assume that the Ellsworthians regarded all these methods as equally good. "If so," says Allen, "it can hardly be taken as proof of their having a definite system of punctuation, which others should hesitate to discard."¹

Here to remain as old-fashioned him which a reformer often, how ever there a critic of River Wilson's speculation to right be, shall

Mr John Westington's translation of Ariste's *Friend's Dialogue* is compared with the book printed from it. The manuscript, MS. A. 1.1.1.1., described in the catalog as Mr John's own handwriting, was used for the original edition of the work by Richard Field in 1571. It has numerous corrections and alterations of passages, with instructions to the printer. We should expect that with so excellent an opportunity for comparison between a book and its manuscript copy they would have been used to the utmost and most painstaking examination. But though he does compare the two, he does so in a desultory, unsystematic, and impracticable manner that is almost a total waste of the available material. To my knowledge this piece of bibliographical research lying so easily to hand for anyone with access to the British Museum has still to be done. The job to be done properly would have to show an accurate count of the number of changes, a categorical division of the kind of changes, and an analysis of the meaning of the statistical data.

¹Allen, p. 141.

not done. Professor Brown, for example, in the introduction to his edition of *Idiom* says:

The pronunciation has been altered so little as possible. With due regard for Himmelfarb's practice, I have straightened out the obvious suprasegmental errors of anticipation, overemphasis and oversight; but in general I have interfered only when I thought that a modern reader accustomed to 17th century usage would be considerably misled, or when the pointing, by its two standards in the copy-text in question, seemed indubitably wrong. One caveat, of course, is wholly inexcusable in introducing consistent standards in such a process; however I have tried to be neither obvious nor intrusive. . . . The Himmelfarb way of pointing for scholarly students has not been tampered with; the reader should go else easily to understand the variable early practices.¹

(This is especially counter to the spirit of the understanding often evinced by *Idiom*, for the variable practice Professor Brown here refers to is that sometimes quines and sometimes the rare milnesquines mark itself out most stark as should not only the latter--in other words, lack of uniformity should not in itself tempt one to regularize by uniformization.)

When the originals have used accents which, from either the historical or the typographical view, ought well to be altered to heavier marks, I have let them stand if the modification and union would be helplessly clear to a reader familiar with Himmelfarb usage.²

But *Idiom* goes on to raise many other reasonable objections to the conclusions of "the group." It points out, for example, that merely to claim a pointing does not conform to modern syntactic convention it does not follow that there is an syntactic convention which it is following. It gives the example, for instance, of Himmelfarb's "some between sentences"

¹Brown, *Idiom*, 1, vii.

²Brown, 2, vii.

and deliver" and quotes the two lines: "had you I give up sensual race, the realm" and "I could have given up Thais's dream, a dream." "Surely," he says, "there is no reason to view these verses as in any way suggestive of a peculiar vocal effect, as distinguished from a careless indication of the construction of the sentence."¹ He observes that both cases of punctuation, the "realm" and the syntactic, come in weak slots by slots. In other words, since the coincidence implies that the vocal pause comes at the division between the direct and the indirect objects, there is no way of knowing which of these facts the verse signifies.

The most important allegation of all, of course, is that there is a failure to distinguish among manuscript copy, Quarto text, and Folio, which for none of the applications made of Hargrove's general observations is would be essential to do. "Detailed research of a character apparently not yet really begun" would be needed before acquiring results "like those suggested by Mr. Wilson in his general case on punctuation."²

The next attack, a year later, is even tamer, less reasonable than Wilson's, and more thoroughly agreed to the notion that there is no evidence that any other system than the syntactic one ever prevailed. Thomas Wilson was willing to admit that punctuation was a "compromise between these two things--the representation of special pauses, and the representation of grammatical structure," Charles C. Follen in a paper

¹ Wilson, p. 507.

² Wilson, p. 507. To have that as subsequent evidence of the Eng. Cambridge Manuscripts' former ignorance of bibliographical problems is in evidence, but the method of marshaling answers is, as Follen himself might say, pseudobibliographical.

criticized "Rhetoricorum Praeceptorum"¹ maintains that although particular lines serve as a guide to the eye for "lyrics of power," these "lyrics of power" are precisely at the places "dictated by the system and structure of the sentence." And he quotes Deming's The Modern Principles of Metrics (1900)² to bolster his case,

When a pause has to be judged in, to bolster up the same structure, and where all else without the pause is would be left ambiguous or uncertain, the sentence itself is wrong,—its words mischosen.³

This is as far from being relevant to the nature of my dramatic sentence as he is willing. It is ludicrous to say that no character ought to be allowed on stage without a prepared speech in which all first thoughts have been replaced by final thoughts in full Aristotelian style.

Felix betrays the same sort of misunderstanding in analyzing a passage from A Midsummer Night's Dream to show it would prove his point, whereas the fact is that any value it has as evidence points the other way. He quotes:

Demetrius: If we offend, it is with our good will. That you should think, we come not to offend, but with good will. To show our simple skill, That is the true beginning of our end, Consider then we come but to dispense.

We do not come as meddling to condemn you. Our love

¹See Stephen D. Richardson, Milton and Demos (New York, 1925).

²Deming, p. 111.

³Deming, p. 76.

Subst. is, all for your delight is not here,
 that you should have regard you, the actors are at
 hand, and by their side You shall have all that you
 are like to have.¹

(Act V, 1, *Tragedy*)

He says: "Of the punctuation here has significance only for
 sense and as relation to syntax and structure, the lower lower each of
 its parts." He seems to be forgetting that when there are points to in-
 dicate that (since we stressing the sentence only as would not have to
was doing it, and there would be no lower structure.²

Travis³ final point is that even there another system of pointing
 than the syntactic, which marks off the parts of a sentence for which the
 steps are used, there would have been mention of it in the grammar from
 1280 to 1290. He cites Farnham, Baker, Davies, and Hill, as well as
 De la Motte, but he makes mention of Cooper⁴ and Hart⁵ and of the work-

¹Travis, p. 11. Travis is here largely following the punctuation of
 Q1, but he suppressed the last point: there is a comma after "were," not
 a period. Also the comma after "hand" is a comma in Q1. It is interesting
 to see that even here where everything depends on the punctuation,
 the Folio compositor cannot resist a few small changes even to anti-
 cipation 1.1, even to antithesis after "hand."

²That the passage above actually is that some part of Folio
 syntax's intention at least must have been conveyed by him to the
 compositor and has gotten through to us despite all the vicissitudes
 of scribal, compositorial, and proofreader edition.

³Christopher Cooper's *English Syntax* (1871), ed. Lucile Hardy
 (New York in English, 1911, 1913, 1915). "Every sentence, although
 it be made up of words as such, which depends upon the context, notions
 in respect of construction are sense both one period, and might be here
 as well. A principal sentence which depends upon the context in respect
 of sense, but not construction, as a subordinate." P. 117.

⁴John Hart, *The Grammar of the Unpublished Writings of an English
 Poet 1581-1611* (New York 1912) 17.2.1115 is John Hart's *English as
 Spoken in the 16th and 17th Centuries* 1581, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1589, 1590, 1591, 1592, 1593, 1594, 1595, 1596, 1597, 1598, 1599, 1600, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, 1608, 1609, 1610, 1611, 1612, 1613, 1614, 1615, 1616, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1620, 1621, 1622, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1626, 1627, 1628, 1629, 1630, 1631, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635, 1636, 1637, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1641, 1642, 1643, 1644, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648, 1649, 1650, 1651, 1652, 1653, 1654, 1655, 1656, 1657, 1658, 1659, 1660, 1661, 1662, 1663, 1664, 1665, 1666, 1667, 1668, 1669, 1670, 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674, 1675, 1676, 1677, 1678, 1679, 1680, 1681, 1682, 1683, 1684, 1685, 1686, 1687, 1688, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1697, 1698, 1699, 1700, 1701, 1702, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1710, 1711, 1712, 1713, 1714, 1715, 1716, 1717, 1718, 1719, 1720, 1721, 1722, 1723, 1724, 1725, 1726, 1727, 1728, 1729, 1730, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1734, 1735, 1736, 1737, 1738, 1739, 1740, 1741, 1742, 1743, 1744, 1745, 1746, 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750, 1751, 1752, 1753, 1754, 1755, 1756, 1757, 1758, 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762, 1763, 1764, 1765, 1766, 1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, 1773, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783, 1784, 1785, 1786, 1787, 1788, 1789, 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794, 1795, 1796, 1797, 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1811, 1812, 1813, 1814, 1815, 1816, 1817, 1818, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1825, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 2681, 2682, 2683, 2684, 2685, 2686, 2687, 2688, 2689, 2690, 2691, 2692, 2693, 2694, 2695, 2696, 2697, 2698, 2699, 2700, 2701, 2702, 2703, 2704, 2705, 2706, 2707, 2708, 2709, 2710, 2711, 2712, 2713, 2714, 2715, 2716, 2717, 2718, 2719, 2720, 2721, 2722, 2723, 2724, 2725, 2726, 2727, 2728, 2729, 2730, 2731, 2732, 2733, 2734, 2735, 2736, 2737, 2738, 2739, 2740, 2741, 2742, 2743, 2744, 2745, 2746, 2747, 2748, 2749, 2750, 2751, 2752, 2753, 2754, 2755, 2756, 2757, 2758, 2759, 2760, 2761, 2762, 2763, 2764, 2765, 2766, 2767, 2768, 2769, 2770, 2771, 2772, 2773, 2774, 2775, 2776, 2777, 2778, 2779, 2780, 2781, 2782, 2783, 2784, 2785, 2786, 2787, 2788, 2789, 2790, 2791, 2792, 2793, 2794, 2795, 2796, 2797, 2798, 2799, 2800, 2801, 2802, 2803, 2804, 2805, 2806, 2807, 2808, 2809, 2810, 2811, 2812, 2813, 2814, 2815, 2816, 2817, 2818, 2819, 2820, 2821, 2822, 2823, 2824, 2825, 2826, 2827, 2828, 2829, 2830, 2831, 2832, 2833, 2834, 2835, 2836, 2837, 2838, 2839, 2840, 2841, 2842, 2843, 2844, 2845, 2846, 2847, 2848, 2849, 2850, 2851, 2852, 2853, 2854, 2855, 2856, 2857, 2858, 2859, 2860, 2861, 2862, 2863, 2864, 2865, 2866, 2867, 2868, 2869, 2870, 2871, 2872, 2873, 2874, 2875, 2876, 2877, 2878, 2879, 2880, 2881, 2882, 2883, 2884, 2885, 2886, 2887, 2888, 2889, 2890, 2891, 2892, 2893, 2894, 2895, 2896, 2897, 2898, 2899, 2900, 2901, 2902, 2903, 2904, 2905, 2906, 2907, 2908, 2909, 2910, 2911, 2912, 2913, 2914, 2915, 2916, 2917, 2918, 2919, 2920, 2921, 2922, 2923, 2924, 2925, 2926, 2927, 2928, 2929, 2930, 2931, 2932, 2933, 2934, 2935, 2936, 2937, 2938, 2939, 2940, 2941, 2942, 2943, 2944, 2945, 2946, 2947, 2948, 2949, 2950, 2951, 2952, 2953, 2954, 2955, 2956, 2957, 2958, 2959, 2960, 2961, 2962, 2963, 2964, 2965, 2966, 2967, 2968, 2969, 2970, 2971, 2972, 2973, 2974, 2975, 2976, 2977, 2978, 2979, 2980, 2981, 2982, 2983, 2984, 2985, 2986, 2987, 2988, 2989, 2990, 2991, 2992, 2993, 2994, 2995, 2996, 2997, 2998, 2999, 3000, 3001, 3002, 3003, 3004, 3005, 3006, 3007, 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011, 3012, 3013, 3014, 3015, 3016, 3017, 3018, 3019, 3020, 3021, 3022, 3023, 3024, 3025, 3026, 3027, 3028, 3029, 3030, 3031, 3032, 3033, 3034, 3035, 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, 3042, 3043, 3044, 3045, 3046, 3047, 3048, 3049, 3050, 3051, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3055, 3056, 3057, 3058, 3059, 3060, 3061, 3062, 3063, 3064, 3065, 3066, 3067, 3068, 3069, 3070, 3071, 3072, 3073, 3074, 3075, 3076, 3077, 3078, 3079, 3080, 3081, 3082, 3083, 3084, 3085, 3086, 3087, 3088, 3089, 3090, 3091, 3092, 3093, 3094, 3095, 3096, 3097, 3098, 3099, 3100, 3101, 3102, 3103, 3104, 3105, 3106, 3107, 3108, 3109, 3110, 3111, 3112, 3113, 3114, 3115, 3116, 3117, 3118, 3119, 3120, 3121, 3122, 3123, 3124, 3125, 3126, 3127, 3128, 3129, 3130, 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134, 3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, 3140, 3141, 3142, 3143, 3144, 3145, 3146, 3147, 3148, 3149, 3150, 3151, 3152, 3153, 3154, 3155, 3156, 3157, 3158, 3159, 3160, 3161, 3162, 3163, 3164, 3165, 3166, 3167, 3168, 3169, 3170, 3171, 3172, 3173, 3174, 3175, 3176, 3177, 3178, 3179, 3180, 3181, 3182, 3183, 3184, 3185, 3186, 3187, 3188, 3189, 3190, 3191, 3192, 3193, 3194, 3195, 3196, 3197, 3198, 3199, 3200, 3201, 3202, 3203, 3204, 3205, 3206, 3207, 3208, 3209, 3210, 3211, 3212, 3213, 3214, 3215, 3216, 3217, 3218, 3219, 3220, 3221, 3222, 3223, 3224, 3225, 3226, 3227, 3228, 3229, 3230, 3231, 3232, 3233, 3234, 3235, 3236, 3237, 3238, 3239, 3240, 3241, 3242, 3243, 3244, 3245, 3246, 3247, 3248, 3249, 3250, 3251, 3252, 3253, 3254, 3255, 3256, 3257, 3258, 3259, 3260, 3261, 3262, 3263, 3264, 3265, 3266, 3267, 3268, 3269, 3270, 3271, 3272, 3273, 3274, 3275, 3276, 3277, 3278, 3279, 3280, 3281, 3282, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, 3295, 3296, 3297, 3298, 3299, 3300, 3301, 3302, 3303, 3304, 3305, 3306, 3307, 3308, 3309, 3310, 3311, 3312, 3313, 3314, 3315, 3316, 3317, 3318, 3319, 3320, 3321, 3322, 3323, 3324, 3325, 3326, 3327, 3328, 3329, 3330, 3331, 3332, 3333, 3334, 3335, 3336, 3337, 3338, 3339, 3340, 3341, 3342, 3343, 3344, 3345, 3346, 3347, 3348, 3349, 3350, 3351, 3352, 3353, 3354, 3355, 3356, 3357, 3358, 3359, 3360, 3361, 3362, 3363, 3364, 3365, 3366, 3367, 3368, 3369, 3370, 3371, 3372, 3373, 3374, 3375, 3376, 3377, 3378, 3379, 3380, 3381, 3382, 3383, 3384, 3385, 3386, 3387, 3388, 3389, 3390, 3391, 3392, 3393, 3394, 3395, 3396, 3397, 3398, 3399, 3400, 3401, 3402, 3403, 3404, 3405, 3406, 3407, 3408, 3409, 3410, 3411, 3412, 3413, 3414, 3415, 3416, 3417, 3418, 3419, 3420, 3421, 3422, 3423, 3424, 3425, 3426, 3427, 3428, 3429, 3430, 3431, 3432, 3433, 3434, 3435, 3436, 3437, 3438, 3439, 3440, 3441, 3442, 3443, 3444, 3445, 3446, 3447, 3448, 3449, 3450, 3451, 3452, 3453, 3454, 3455, 3456, 3457, 3458, 3459, 3460, 3461, 3462, 3463, 3464, 3465, 3466, 3467, 3468, 3469, 3470, 3471

period to which they both refer. It is not material, however. There is little doubt that the use of the point to indicate reading was related to the sentence form which it is assumed never got past the prototypical grammar. The whole usefulness of the device is precisely that it brought into a previously intended system; it is self-evident, so it were.

A useful and serious paper is Father Og's patient survey of the history of punctuation prompt from the eleventh-century grammatical record.¹ In my opinion his final analysis of the nature of Elizabethan punctuation is no nearer the mark than that of any of his predecessors, but he sheds light on the nature of manuscript practice, which ought to have been considered from the beginning. His conclusion is:

Despite the growing dependence on comma and on occasional reference to spaces, the most telling characteristic, then, of Elizabethan and Jacobean punctuation theory remains the fact that it never cut itself loose from the traditional view of punctuation as basically a physiological rather than either an idiosyncrasy or a syntactical (logical) device. The fact that one has to breathe has been a primary consideration at a time when all discourse, in keeping with the rhetorical tradition, was considered of as a living system rather than written.²

and *Philosophical Introductions*, Sachs and Edwin Tychsen, ed. New Amsterdam/Brussels Studies in English, V, Amsterdam, 1933). "A further observation the learners of our . . . English writing, that they ought to write great letters, at the beginning of every sentence, after the full point; that after the *And* and *But*; except now like short sentences as follow, for then the great letter is written after the last." P, 161.

¹Julius J. Og, S. J., "Historical Backgrounds of Elizabethan and Jacobean Punctuation Theory," *MLA*, 12 (1941), 347-368.

²Og, p. 367. It is amusing in this connection to note the French grammarian Lemaire's aphorism "il est évident que la respiration n'a rien, autrement dit, d'essentiel avec la punctuation." P. A. Lemaire, *Grammaire de Jean Lemaire* (De ed. Paris, 1867), II, 120. Cited by Peter Hume in "Elizabethan and Jacobean English Punctuation Theory," *English Studies*, XII, No. 2 (April 1937), 71.

and finally:

With regard to actual practice in the age of Shakespeare and Jonson, we can reasonably assume that it conformed in some way to the prevailing theories, even allowance is made for the "capitulum" and "hemistichium" errors, and indeed this allowance, in view of the elasticity of the Henry Stead, need not, perhaps, be as great as we have supposed.¹

The most widespread claim for a correspondence system of punctuation were made by Richard Flatter in a book entitled Shakespeare's Punctuation Book. A Study of His Books of Exercises in his Hand in the First Folio with the epigraph "His mind and hand went together: John De Witt, *British Consul*."²

It is a work of which Professor Bowen has said:

The error [of seeing as though he believed that an author and his own type, paraphrased his book, repeating every minute detail of its notations], and that a printed book is not a faithful mechanical report of the author's own script but a facsimile of it and in type succeeds very thoroughly in turning his personal criticism into clarity.³

Flatter's book has done, on my leisurely speculation about Shakespeare is likely to have, but the punctuation section is innocent of even the most pretentious philological considerations. However, although it surely repeats in very characteristically imaginative terms the kind of speculation Percy Hume began with, and adds nothing such but enthusiasm to the controversy about what the individual stops signify, it does contain

¹Op., p. 360.

²Richard Flatter, Shakespeare's Punctuation Book (New York, 1948).

³"New Relations of Philology to Editorial Problems," Essays in Philology, III (1928-29), 61. Cf. also his review in British Academy, 1948.

the kind which is now and ever, remaining.

we should not so much look for an explanation why he gave just this and no other work, but rather try to find out why he gave any work at all.¹

The "he" is, of course, Tapscott, but since, as we shall see from the bibliographical evidence, there is reason to believe that the least fragment of all thought by comparison is the selection of a work of particular value, the present paper is a useful discussion.

The latest work on what used to now be regarded as, on the whole, the British side of the controversy is that of A. C. Fortbridge.²

This is an altogether puzzling work. It is hard to understand why it was written in the first place, since it gives only a sketch of Huxley's work of 1811³ and a summary of Fortbridge's own previous work on *Onians*,⁴ unless its purpose was purely belittling. Its attitude towards the "American bibliographical school" betrays the bias of Huxley that should have been rendered useless by the amount of achievement of the Huxley collection, of which Fortbridge actually takes passing note. But he says:

The likelihood that any reputable printing house, under its name, could place editorial responsibility of the kind that this new [1921] school allows for the benefit of the over-proud is hardly to be doubted.⁵

¹ *Platon*, p. 120.

² A. C. Fortbridge, *Onians: a study of his influence on Huxley and Huxley's influence on Onians*, *A Study of Colonial Institutions, Culture, Thought and Power* (London, 1961).

³ Fortbridge, p. 126.

⁴ Fortbridge, p. 125.

⁵ Fortbridge, p. 131.

Since what Mr. Fortbridge can hardly conceive will in the sequel be shown to have been fully comprehended and demonstrated by Dr. Hume and, in a indirect way, by the present study, this point of view need not detain us here.

A recent work which is of value is a paper entitled "Baroque Prose in the Thirteenth: Don Juanes" by James A. Berlin.¹ Mr. Berlin has an especial interest in punctuation, his purpose is to illustrate how Donya T. Cozill's theory of style applies to Don Juanes's prose, and in particular in the prose he uses in his plays. In applying Cozill's categorization of misdirectionism or Baroque style to Juanes, Mr. Berlin has this to say:

The court style, or, as it was sometimes called, the *style arabe* or *style arabo*, uses its various means to *disrupt* phrases and paragraphs in contrast to Classical "coherence"; and its characteristic device is the so-called "explosive period," composed of independent members set off from each other not by syntactic ligatures but by colons or semicolons (or, in the case of dramatic prose, often by commas). The members of such a period tend to inequality, as the name suggests, but also in irregularity of length, variation in form, and unpredictability of order, a sort of style which, as Cozill observes, communicates the effect of live thinking rather than of logical presentation.²

In other words, if the fiction is that of a man thinking, rather than that of a man repeating a previously expressed thought, the structure of his utterance will not be the same as that of a completely re-vised speech. Sometimes in an effort to maintain upon the structure will be concerned, and sometimes the original system will be abandoned altogether. In order to indicate the nature of such structures, mis-

¹ibid., LITTLE Glee, 1990, 110-111.

²Berlin, p. 115.

apologetic rather than apologetic signals must be given.

It will be obvious that the type of "hiss-hiss-t" speculation and controversy that has marked what amounts to the entire of Elmer Iseler's punctuation for the last fifty years could yield no very reliable conclusions. That has been needed in something in the nature of fact—or at least verifiable probability—and attempts to find evidence have been few.

The kind of evidence which would have been most valuable in the case of Shakespeare's texts, for example, would have been direct evidence of Jaggard's attitude towards punctuation who had anything to do with them, statements by either the printers or the authors (and this, of course, would include Shakespeare himself) of their professed principles. These have not emerged.

Lacking such statements we can supply them only by inference. Before we can infer anything at all, however, it is necessary to ask the right questions. Where are the marks of punctuation that we see in the text? What relation, if any, do they bear to authorial marks of punctuation, if any? Was punctuation considered to be of enough account for the use of the printing house to be concerned with it in a meaningful way? If so, was their ordinary concern to define and regularize system, as mine is, or did they have an ancient system of their own?

Now we say that the aim of Jaggard's shop "was to be plain," do we consider the possibility that faithful reproduction of every one set, as with us, the destination for a compositor? Was there an inherent affinity between copy and compositor, between compositor and us? In

other words, how many stages has the palimpsest?

In order to answer any of these questions facts have been needed, and at least we have this in the monumental study of Dr. Simon, The Fragment and Pencil-Work of the First Folio of Shakespeare.¹

For the purposes of studying palimpsestic practices the two particularly important facts that Dr. Simon has unearthed are the ninety palimpsestic variants out of the total 300 odd, and the identification of the two compositors of the Fragment and Pencil pages. The significance of the first is self-evident. It enables us to maintain that the present-day textual palimpsest is of sufficient importance to change, delete, or add, and the fact that there are some ninety such changes enables us to study them with some hope of arriving at some understanding of his textual attitude.

The second fact, the identification of the two compositors, I and K, of the Fragment and Pencil pages, enables us to maintain the way of the compositor with his copy. See title is uniquely as requires perhaps a bit of spelling out.

One of the serious obstacles to any attempt to maintain the relationship between the Folio fragments and copy has been that there is a great deal of uncertainty about what was used for copy in any individual play. Some of the plays have been assigned with an apparently high degree of probability to certain kinds of copy. In the case of the plays for which there are extant Quartos there has been a good deal of disagreement

¹Charles Simon, The Fragment and Pencil-Work of the First Folio of Shakespeare (2 vols. Oxford: 1945).

among scholars, and in the case where there are none and manuscript copy is postulated there is little to be done but speculate. In the unique case of Quarta and Folia, however, there is unanimous agreement and virtual certainty that the Quarta was copy for the Folia. In one, therefore, compare copy with print Quarta with Folia with almost as much confidence as reconstructed state and corrected state in the Folia itself. If in the latter case we can debate something about how the professorial treated what the composer set, then in the former case we can debate something about how the composer's treated their copy. Furthermore, from the fact that P's page and P's page differ essentially in their relation to the Quarta, we can debate with a high degree of probability that the composers made their own editorial changes--there was no editorial revision of the copy which both composers faithfully followed. All of this will be set out in clear and orderly fashion in the following pages. Let first a word about the Harvard collection and what it has yielded to the way of facts.

Part I

The Harvard Collection of the First Folia of Bachmann

Among the eighty copies of the First Folia in the Folger Collection, there are now already five printed exemplars of every page of the Folia text proper. Of these Dr. Simon collected about forty¹ in the

¹Numbers 20-61, 63, 66, 67, 71, 72, 74, 76, 78-84, 86, 88, 90, 91-94, 96-98, and the various fragments that are not numbered as separate whole copies were not included in the collection.

course of the monumental investigation reported in The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare.¹ He discovered that there were about 500 proof variants on some 180 forms. In about half of these forms the uncorrected state is present in more than 10 per cent of the copies examined. As Dr. Simon concludes, therefore, "a substantial number of corrections was usually made from the uncorrected state of a form before correction was effected."² Hardly there are more than two states.

It has long been known that proof-reading was done for the Folio printing, for there are four proof-pages extant, one each from Hamlet and Julius, from Long, from Shilling, and from Anthony and Cleopatra, the latter having been discovered by Halliwell-Phillips and reproduced in a facsimile catalogue as early as 1816. But what could not be known until now was how the proof-reading was done, how much, in what purpose and with what effort. The answer to all these questions may now be given with reasonable certainty.

To take up the method of proof-reading first, it is necessary to mention that, among other things, Dr. Simon has discovered a very important fact about the unusual order in which type was set for the Folio. It had always been assumed previously that type was set in the order in which one reads, but this turns out not to be the case. Instead type was

¹Charles Simon, The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare (2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911). All references to these volumes will henceforth be given by volume and page number alone.

²I, 264.

ordinarily cut from the innermost sheet of a quire (cf. L. 1). The inside of the innermost sheet, then the outside of the innermost sheet, next the inside of the sheet next the innermost sheet, then its outside, etc. When it is recalled that each sheet of a Folio is divided in two, it will be seen that the unit of printing is a two-page form, albeit, inasmuch as the Folio pages were gathered in sheets, only the inner form of the innermost sheet prints two consecutive pages. The impression that one takes, for proof-reading, therefore, was a sheet containing two pages. Nevertheless, only one page of the sheet could be proof-read before it was handed back to the compositor who would then reset the galleys and begin to reset his type. While in one respect, another impression of the same sheet could be proof-read for the second page. If the second page were proof-read by the time the type for the first page had been reset, the compositor could then immediately begin to reset the second page of the form, and no time would be lost. Small wonder then that one page of a variant form ordinarily shows considerably fewer changes than the other¹ and that in some cases the foreworts of a variant page may be altogether missing. In the whole of the tragedies, for example, there are some ten forms that are variant in both pages but twenty-one forms that are variant in only one page.²

As for how such proof-reading was done, there was very little altogether, and the pages which were selected for proof-reading do not show

¹ L. 100.

² L. 108.

to be spread in any mechanically ordered way. The number taken as a whole contains only twenty-eight pages (out of more than 100) which show great variation, and these rather randomly. Of the total of seventy variants, page 64 in The Two Brothers of Tynnes alone contains twenty. This seems to have been used as a test check and shows evidence of having been read very carefully, not of the variants, unlike any other in the collection, suggesting possible reference to copy.¹

Of the 145 pages of Historie only thirty-seven show variants that reflect proof-correction, and they total twenty-two.² Of the errors of the correction Mr. Kline has this to say:

Every play in the Historie but one (Henry V) shows at least some evidence of proof-correction. Only one play, however, has any great number of variants. None of the twenty-nine pages of 1 Henry VI (K1V-63) were printed, and some twenty-eight corrections were made. Not more than the usual amount of attention may have been given to 1 Henry VI only because the proof-reader had just discovered a considerable omission from the original setting of the last page of the preceding play, Richard III. The copy for this page had been corrected, an important lapse on the part of a skilled compositor had been revealed, and some lively work had thus been necessary in order to effect such appropriate typographical measures the restoration of what had been left out. . . . And for at least a short time after this our reader did wonder how proof-reading then he had done historie. Even such uncharacteristic efforts as he made with Henry V and I, however, were not sustained. Evidently he was more willing to value his vigilance again because he found, or was now consulting the copy in the course of his proof-reading for page five, not only that no serious errors had been committed but also that a superficial examination of what he appeared had been made. . . . In this or in any,

¹2, 210.

²It is difficult to count variants. It is often an arbitrary device whether a change is to be counted as one or two variants, and it is sometimes a matter of uncertainty whether a purely typographical change was done by accident or by unsuccessful design or correct.

however, the proofreading that was done for the Kingston and London editions was even at its best sporadic and it was in the main concerned only with the elimination of obvious errors--of those that, as a general rule, had no significant effect on meaning. The few substantive changes that young made, moreover, were evidently designed rather to provide an acceptable than an accurate text.¹

Of the final section of the Folio, that containing the Tragedies, 317 pages contain dramatic text, and twenty-five of these show 173 variants that reflect proof-correction. In Dr. Simon's own words:

The main conclusions can at once be drawn from these facts: (i) that by work the greater part of the proof-reading that was done for the Folio was devoted to some six of the twelve plays that make up the final section of the book; and (ii) that the desirability of reviewing the work of Compositor E was the principal reason for the unusually large amount of proofing that was done during the printing of some (but not all) of the Tragedies.²

The second conclusion brings us to the other of Dr. Simon's remarkable facts. He has distinguished the work of five separate compositors, and he has been able to make attributions in the case of almost every page, sometimes identifying two compositors in the two respective columns, and he has devised a chronology page by page. The details of the evidence for this knowledge are given with painstaking thoroughness and impeccable logic in the body of his work. The identification of the compositors depends largely on spelling idiosyncrasies, particularly on the words "be," "ye," and "here," and partly on type worn; the determination of the chronology, on the identification of individual types and other information about the Jaggard printing establishment. But these

¹ ib. 281.

² ib. 282.

two important facts which plain the conclusion that compositor E, an inexperienced apprentice, was called on to set type when the regular compositors A and B were busy with something else. This brings us to the purpose of proofing and its efficiency.

It was seriously well known to Jaggard that compositor E was incompetent and that his work was likely to require a good deal of correction. There seems to be an other satisfactory explanation for the fact that his work actually was proofed much more conscientiously than that of any other *First Folio* compositor and that half the variants in the *Tempest* are to be seen in the relatively few pages of this portion that were set by him.²

But what of the purpose of the proof-reading? Dr. Mason is at pains to point out again and again that it was the clerical errors rather than the more dangerous kind that the proof-reader was interested in, and of these the typographical faults would be his greatest concern. The most vivid picture of the proof-reader's point of view is given in the section entitled "The Proof-reader" in which Isaac Jaggard himself is proposed as the most likely candidate for the role,

The picture that emerges from all this, I submit, is of a busy man who had undertaken, by means of an such proof-reading as he considered necessary and was able to find time to do himself, to see to it that the *First Folio* was satisfactorily completed. Of course he was not positively indifferent to the accuracy of the text, but his labours affected the text proper very little and can hardly be said to have improved it. Such obvious substantive errors as he noticed he tried to eliminate; but he noticeably did so without referring to the copy and the result was sometimes (as has not generally still been recognized) rather a further corruption than a restoration of the true reading. Not that he introduced a good many extremely wrong readings, for he seldom concerned himself with substantive errors. The primary interest of the *Folio* proof-reader was always in turning out

² *ib.* 321.

a book that was not entered by had many purely typographical blunders to recommend itself as a well-printed work, as a physically attractive volume that might be expected to find ready sale among the buyers of such books and expensive time-would not to diagnose the jagged cover. As for the disliking with which it reproduced copy, this could in the main be attributed to the use the set of late type. . . . From such use, whatever his name may have been, he suggested to us by the approximately 300 printed variants I have found in the Folio; and it seems probable that James Jaggard was such a man. For to be sure to suggest any other.¹

As for the final effect of Jaggard's work in the case of *Compositio* 8, probably the apprentice John Iaggon,² Dr. Henson observes:

that the proof-reader appears not to have recognized (since he should definitely find that such of P's text was plain proofed) was that this was one likely to discover it as well as to correct. On some other a fewer occasions he failed to carry out what was to be supposed to be the reader's instructions and compounded rather than corrected his original errors. . . . *Compositio* 8 was not wholly clean in this. He at least was at the occasion. . . . *Compositio* 8 appears also to have misapprehended but the fault is found frequently only in P's text. And it is partly because this work was not ordinarily noticed after being once corrected (although a few of the pages in the Tragædies are in three different states, and one appears to be in four) that the later of two readings in this portion of the book in which were corrupt than the earlier.³

If the confidence of the proof-reading Dr. Henson went up there:

no useful purpose can be served by quibbling over the precise nature of the Folio proof-reader's solicitude for the accuracy with which the text of the plays was reproduced. Concerned about it in a general way he definitely was. He was constantly to have examined the copy by way of checking up on how well his compositors were doing their work and for a time thereafter to have given more attention or less attention to proof-reading than before, in accordance with his findings at these occasions. Only

¹Id., 218.

²Id., 218.

³Id., 217-218.

as, at any rate, that it was possible to understand the observed facts: the relative scarcity of verse variants in the Quartos after page 54 (in which, the copy being more skilled, an almost entire new line¹) the unusually large number of variants in 1 Henry VI (after a machine correction has been discovered in page 41); and in the surprising concentration of variants in the last three plays of the volume (after a serious error has been found at the beginning of page 101). In general, however, he appears to have been perfectly content to trust the competitors to reproduce the essential substance of the copy they used. For there can be no escaping the conclusion that the principal objective of the proof-reading that was done for the Folio was rather to eliminate superficial blunders than, by regular checking of proof against copy, to secure substantive textual accuracy. And from this it follows—as I suggested at the beginning of this monograph that textual integrity as our text may have depends almost exclusively upon the fidelity with which the various Folio competitors reproduced their copy, and upon the most scrupulous to the collection of the proof-readers who corrected their work.²

And he adds in a footnote:

almost nothing, that is, that can now be accurately judged. The same fact that there was a reader and that he did receive a good deal of what was set very well have played an important part in keeping the competitors free from becoming wholly careless—the more especially if that reader was indeed James Leggett. Hence I am hardly disposed to declare that we should be better off than we are had we proofreaded as we will have done for the Folio. I cannot believe that we should. Yet one can scarcely deny that the actual corrections that were made gain or possibly little. Now, consequently, one can very well fall so one that one of the great needs of Shakespearean textual study is for such work such has yet been done as the capabilities and failings of individual competitors.³

What I propose to do in this study is to collate and collate all the punctuation variants from the variants cited by Dr. Elton from as many vantage points as possible, accepting all the general conclusions he has

¹ 1, 153-154.

² 1, 158, n. 1.

even so, and even if my useful deductions emerge from the evidence on the subject of the prosecution of the First Folio. For example, one foreseeable and significant deduction may be made at the outset from the mere fact that there are prosecution variants, and that is the circumstance that the proof-reader did not ignore prosecution.

Of the 500 odd variants, approximately or slightly more than 10 per cent are prosecution.¹ Since this is only a little less than 10 per cent of the total, we might conclude further that the proof-reader paid as much attention to prosecution as to anything else on a line. If the great majority of variants were purely typographical, we might conclude that the typographers of the slipcase would call attention to itself more forcefully than a skilful editor and that since, as Dr. Blount had pointed out, superficial impossibility was the destination, attention would be paid to this kind of error for no other reason. However, since the great majority of prosecution variants, as we shall see, are substantive, care for appearance cannot be an adequate explanation.

Although each variant ought to be individually examined for any included insight which its various arguments, it will be evident that the convenience of empirical classification for the purpose of statistical inference is not to be denied. In those cases where a quote might have served as copy for the compositor, the quote reading will be

XX

¹Again it is difficult to know how to count. Sometimes a correction is not intended to change prosecution, but is introduced to do so; in other cases the reverse is true. Not every variant will be corrected, and statistical comment will be only of the most casual kind, the point is no more material here than in Dr. Blount's totals.

considered along with the two states of the Fells given by Dr. Simon.¹

Finally, in the case of the Home and Jelling pages, an attempt will be made to determine whether a given compositor has particular idiosyncrasies in such basic spelling idiosyncrasies. Although no attempt has yet been made by Dr. Simon to study punctuation for the purpose of compositor identification, he reports:

Professor Jensen has just written me: "By all the marks visible in the pages of Jelling composed out by A, practically none in C's pages!" I hesitate to declare that I have not investigated this matter; but a very quick glance at Jelling III seems to show the same peculiarities. Perhaps on Small II that the incidence of semicolons provides me further means, and possibly an extremely useful one, of identifying C's work.

That there was an pre-arranged distribution of compositors between the compositor and the proofreader is certain, for in that case there would have had to be a routine of proof-reading for each page instead of the sporadic kind that Simon has shown is first noticed. For example, to suppose that the compositor set copy without correcting because he knew that the proof-reader would correct, or to suppose that the proof-reader was expected to impose a uniform system of punctuation, are not both hypotheses contrary to fact.

Furthermore, from the evidence of the Home and Jelling compositors

¹Quarto pages, like Fells pages, often occur in several states, and, aside from the question of hand-set versus Quarto copy, or its spread for any of the slight, the factoids of the printed Quarto or one using any very well be variant from the copy the Fells compositor used.

²II, 113.

we can compare with the hypothesis of an editor of copy and decide that the competitors dealt with copy directly, each according to his own lights.

In the light of these considerations, then, we will have to a proto-types of all generative variants found in the eleven variants, first a matrix and a set of categorical classifications and then a free commentary on all the variants, one by one.

CHAPTER I

A Census of the Punctuation Variants in the Kinross Collection

There are fourteen plays which contain variants that have to do with punctuation; the four composers concerned are those identified by Kinross as A, B, C, and D. A listing follows showing the present-day page numbers by scene page and by First Folio section page, followed by composer. In the case of Twelfth and Tenthredine, largely reprinted in the Folio, one of the page numbers is that of the Folio Facsimile. A page without the addition v is a recto page; verso pages have the addition v.

	<u>Folio Scene Page</u>	<u>Folio Section Page</u>	<u>Composer</u>	<u>No. of Variants on Page</u>
<u>As You Like It</u>				
<u>Two Gentlemen</u>	10v	(103)	A	3
	11v	(104)	A	6
<u>As You Like It</u>	11	(107)	B	1
<u>Historie Folio Inc., III</u>				
<u>1 Henry VI</u>	11	(114)	B	1
	11v	(114)	B	1
<u>Henry VIII</u>	11v	(118)	C (or A)	3
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>				
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	11v	(118)	A	3
	12v	(118)	B	1
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	1
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	3
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	3
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	1
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	1
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	1
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	1
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	1
<u>Twelfth and Tenthredine</u>	12v	(120)	B	1

ContinuedTwo Continues (continued)

4. word same
5. two same
6. word deleted
7. word deleted
8. period to question mark

In Two Lines

Composition B

1. period to question mark

ElaborationEssay IV, Part I

Composition B

1. colon to semicolon
2. words from sentence righted

Essay VIIIComposition C¹ (essentially A)

1. semicolon to question mark
2. period to question mark
3. same to colon

TranslatingEnglish and Spanish

Composition B

1. same to question mark
2. period to question mark

¹Stann's student's here means "on Composition B".

QuestionsEditing and Formatting (continued)

3. comma to question mark

Composition E

4. comma later to period

Conclusions

Composition E

1. absence of hyphen to hyphen

Using Substitutions

Composition E

1. colon to comma

2. period to comma

3. comma to period

4. hyphen deleted (letter added later)

5. comma deleted (letter added)

6. comma to question mark

7. comma to period

8. moved comma

9. moved comma

10. comma to colon

11. moved comma

12. colon to period

13. moved apostrophe

14. period deleted

15. space from period

QuestionsScore and Folio

Composer B

1. score deleted
2. nothing to score
3. scorely
4. period to score
5. nothing to period
6. score moved
7. scorely
8. score to score
9. nothing to score, score to score
10. moved score
11. nothing to period

Folio Change

Partly by Composer B
Partly by Composer A

1. period to question mark
2. period deleted

Spoken

Composer C* (possibly A)

1. nothing to question mark

Composer B

2. period to score

Composer B

3. nothing to score
4. score moved
5. nothing to spoken
6. spoken deleted

TranslatingMini-Exam

Composition I

1. correctly
2. comma to period
3. nothing to hyphen
4. semicolon deleted
5. comma deleted

Composition I or II

6. nothing to comma

Composition II

7. comma deleted

Composition II (most likely)

8. period deleted, comma added
9. nothing to comma
10. comma moved

Composition II

11. comma to question mark, lower case to capital

Editing

Composition II

1. comma to question mark

Composition II

2. comma deleted
3. nothing to comma
4. comma deleted
5. comma to italic comma

Editing - Insertion

6. nothing (or quad mark) to comma
7. nothing to colon
8. period to colon
9. comma to nothing (or quad mark)

Inserts and Deletions

Compositor B

1. question mark to period
2. nothing to comma
3. upside down apostrophe righted
4. comma to period
5. comma deleted, nothing to comma
6. comma deleted, upside down letter righted
7. nothing to comma

Substituting

Compositor B

1. comma to period
2. lower case to capital
3. period to question mark
4. nothing to comma
5. period to question mark
6. quad mark to double colon
7. double colon to dash
8. comma deleted
9. question mark to period
10. hyphen deleted
11. colon deleted

CHAPTER II

THE PROOF-READER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD PUNCTUATION: A COMPARISON OF THE TWO STATES OF PUNCTUATION TAGGED IN PLAYS SET FROM MANUSCRIPT

Of the fourteen plays in the Folio that show punctuation variants some are thought to be set from manuscript copy and others from Quarto copy, with or without collation with manuscripts.

The seven plays for which we have an extant copy¹ whatever are The Two Gentlemen of Verona, In the Life of Henry VIII, Coriolanus, Julius Caesar, As You Like It, Hamlet, and Twelfth Night. The punctuation variants are considered in their first and second states.

The variants are numbered in order separately for each play. The source page (with the Folio section pagination in parentheses) is given first, then column and line number. Thereafter appears the compositor in whom Blount attributes the setting of the page. Variants on the same page as a previous one are designated only by column and line number. Only one compositor will be assumed to have set a page, unless otherwise stated. The first state is given first. Usually it appears the corrected state.

In commenting on the punctuation variants in those plays for which there is no suggestion of extant copy we can usually compare the compositor's punctuation with the proof-reader's. We have no Quarto which might have served as copy to help us answer the question whether in any given case a lack of punctuation (or the lack of it) is what the compositor

¹copy in the technical sense, copy for the typesetter.

found in his copy or not, or in the latter case why he might have changed his copy. We do know for certain however that the "copy" which the proof-reader is sitting is before us. It is the uncorrected state of the manuscript in the Folio which he considers unsatisfactory; and, except in those cases where the compositor miscorrected, it is the corrected state of the Folio variants which he approved. In the first cases, therefore, those in which there is no printed copy, we focus our attention entirely on the attitude towards punctuation of the proof-reader as related to his treatment of the first state. Hence, as Dr. Hume points out, and as in many of our own observations tend to substantiate and corroborate, the proof-reader did not voluntarily consult copy when he proof-read, nor was the purpose of proof-reading to ascertain fidelity to copy, the punctuation changes are certainly not to be attributed to the desire to restore copy punctuation. The proof-reader's changes, then, are not in any way a function of the punctuation of the copy, nor does his attitude towards punctuation have any necessary connection with the attitude towards punctuation related to the copy from which the compositor set his page. In other words, any resemblance between the reader's punctuation changes and the punctuation, whether printed or authorial, of the manuscript which served as copy is not deliberate, and we can infer nothing directly from his use of punctuation of author or scribe.

The most fruitful use, then, that can be made of the punctuation variants in plays set from manuscript is to observe the punctuating habits of the proof-reader himself and to attempt to deduce something from them about his own attitude towards the issue of punctuation.

Variant in The Two Descriptions of Tasso¹

L.61v(100v)B

Comp. A

lxxx²
lxxxj

The passage in the (presumably) corrected state reads³

lxxx. In after Tasso lxxx, I after lxxx;
In lxxx his friends, in dignitas then xxvj

Previously the reader substituted a correction for a comma after "lxxx" to separate xxvj euphatically the two clauses which are syntactically independent.

2. lxxx

lxxxj⁴
lxxxj

A correction of a purely typographical error.

L.61v(100v)B

Comp. A

xx.
xx?

The corrected passage is as follows:

xx. Item, the two xxvj.
xx. That's as much as to say Quia duo xxvj

¹2, lxxx.

²The correction, and xxvj are given reversed to Simon, but since everything else in the original of the Tale Descriptive, which shows the correction, has the corrected state, we must assume a printing error in Simon.

³All citations of passages from the *Forme Felice*, except those quoted from Simon, are from the Tale Descriptive with careful confirmation and extrapolation from Simon's reports. Cf. Dr. H. H. Robinson's *Commentary, Historical, & Typological*, a Facsimile edition prepared by Ralph Tuckwell (New York, Yale University Press, 1934).

⁴In upside-down correction.

Verbs in The Two Languages of Love, (continued)

"she was mine, and not mine, before" actually changes the tense, then. This is, therefore, not a purely formal change.

3. 146
 him; for . . . long
 him; for . . . long.

4. 148
 going,
 going

3 and 4 are related. The first state of the passage reads:

- 1a. Then must you be him; for then hast staid as
 long that going, will scarce serve the turn.

The second state reads:

- 1a. Then must you be him; for then hast staid as
 long, that going will scarce serve the turn.

Neither seems to be accord with present-day punctuation convention, but the reader's is perhaps more naive than the compositor's. Elizabethan copyists would not have expected that an auxiliary precede.

5. 149
 got,
 got

The passage in the first state reads:

- 2a. Sir Thurio, I am not, but that she will leave you,
 her saluting is twink'd from her sight.

This change might at first sight suggest the removal of the comma in accord with the contemporary notation before a temporal linking clause, but, far more probably, its purpose is to guard against reading the second clause as independent of the first,

Variant to The Two Conditions of Truth (continued)

cannot often being used as two separate independent clauses,¹

The meaning is not, of course, that two independent pieces of information "she will love you" and "Valentine is banished from her sight" are being offered, but that the first will come about because of the second.

2. 142

you.
you?

The uncorrected passage reads

See not his tyranny, in your condition
(According to our translation) you.

You, then, my good lord,

Again our slight alteration, in view especially of the appearance of confusion here, upon the lack of necessity for a rising inflection, is made close to that of the usually rhetorical question. (This is by way of giving the international punctuation convention a fair run.)

Variant to My Two Lilies II²

1.10(107)625

Comp. 8

play.
play?

¹But sometimes this usage: "Richard Lynch is the house-lifter, his brother goes by his side, we do them against the stream, . . ." *Idem*, p. 128.

²*Idem*, 101.

Testimonies in Ja, Ja, Ja, Ja (continued)

The uncorrected passage reads:

That a sage as I is gone, that no soldier a good dialogue,
 not cannot tolerate with you in the behalf of a good play.

This may be an example of the kind of mechanical correction to a question mark referred to.¹ The word "that" does not have have interrogative force. On the other hand, this may be an example of the question mark used as an exclamation mark. It will be interesting to note certain whether any question mark instead of reader marks were not wrong instead. The Folio composers had an exclamation mark available, of course. There is one, for example, in Ja, Ja, Ja, Ja in one of the pages examined in this study.²

Testimonies in Ja, Ja, Ja³

1. and 2. give(100)and
 Comp. (or perhaps A)

Shewin! . . . Question!⁴
 Shewin! . . . Question!

The first state reads:

¹See p. 46.

²The line reads:
Ja, Ja, Ja. 0 def! I have no ill finding words, O' this
 010(100)000.

³L, 179.

⁴In the Ja, Ja, Ja I count this as two variants.

Variants in Journaling

L,msB(11)20

Copy, A.

Michele's head

Michele's head

A strange and trivial change to stop given free, but both
impossibilities and proofreaders seem very hyphen-conscious.
We shall see in the treatment of Quaric copy in Miss Long
that the hyphen is often inserted by both Quaric proof-
readers and Folio copyists independently.

Variants in Julius Caesar

L,msB(11)20

not really by B

partly by A

Michele's head

Michele's head

The mechanical passage reads:

Tit. What Michele's? Where art thou Michele's.

Here an even stronger case might be made for the deliberate use
of the period in the first state. The second Michele's might
well represent a sailing of the name, not a variation in apper-
taining with "thou." He might perhaps see "What, Michele's?"
Where art thou? His answer." On the other hand, Simon says
of one of the variants on this page that it "may well reflect
reference to a copy."¹

¹ Evidence of proof-reading has been found . . . in both our pages
in the state of Journaling (msB-1120) L, 20.

² L, 20.

³ L, 20.

Verities in History and Chemistry (continued)

The corrected line reads:

See, Noble Captain, come, Legend.

Probably a case of killing two birds with one stone. The essential change was undoubtedly the typographical one in Legend.

$$3. \quad \text{all} \quad \frac{by^2}{by^2} \frac{yb^2}{yb^2}$$

A partly typographical change. The spectrographs had been set up side down. But why an spectrograph at all? It might have been intended to be expanded and not collapsed.²

$$4. \text{only}(\text{all})\text{all}$$

Comp. 2

Caesar,
Caesar,

The same after the character attribution is a deviation from the normal pronunciation of a period, and there is in the present sheet an unmistakable lacuna through the same.³

$$5. \quad \text{all} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{that,} \dots \text{there} \\ \text{that} \dots \text{there,} \end{array}$$

The corrected passage reads:

He was the voice for that were he a there,
or there being a man.⁴

²In spectroscopic spectrographs.

³On the other hand, see pp. 71-2 on Legend, and CW1:ed4.

⁴This present-sheet is one of the few leaves still to survive. It is reproduced in the frontispiece to The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare, the monograph by Edwin Wilson Willoughby (printed at the Bodleian Library Press for the Bibliographical Society, 1911).

⁵Like divisions in prose passages are indicated by the diagonal divider.

Exercises in Letter and Clipping (continued)

This, like the correction in The doctoring,¹ improves the sense.

6.

III

I, let $\text{do}^{\frac{1}{2}}$
I let you

The original state reads:

(2nd) I've wanted you to my strength of love.
I wish I knew you, that I, let do you.

Both changes are needed in the proof-sheet, and the deletion of the comma here may well be the most important instance thus far of the proofreader's willingness to ignore possible implications of copy punctuation. Indeed, wrestling with Casson, might have been enough to be throwing Casson to be have passed over the entire thought of how easily he could kill his enemy, and then, in revision, let his poem unfold dramatic events, which there is no other way to indicate in writing than by breaking in on the system, again in the only way possible in writing, by punctuation. A signal would thus be lost with the reworking of the text.

7.

III

speaks : . . . voice's
speaks, : . . . voice's

The uncorrected passage reads:

III. Notes, I heard her speak also to low voice's.

~~~~~

<sup>1</sup>In p. 45, variant 4,

<sup>2</sup>In speaks does II.

Verities in James and Corcoran (continued)

The interesting point here is that a count of all points was chosen. Does this perhaps indicate that the proof-reader may have been experimenting with the syncretic principle in favor of the suggestion of rapid utterances which, perhaps, the absence of any punctuation suggested to him, or does it again follow Scott's dictum<sup>1</sup> that when the clauses are short a comma is as good as a lowering note? The principal change, again, was undoubtedly the "e" to "d" in "verie'd,"

Verities in Coriolanus<sup>2</sup>

L. verie(CO)(44)

Comp. 3

safe,

safe,

The corrected passage reads:

Safe. What lady would you choose to murder?

Safe. Yours, when in company you think stands so safe.

I will lay you him thousands foldings . . .

The period in its second with syncretic phrase. The original count may have been there in its stead to suggest raised speech. Whether it was in the copy or not is uncertain, but if it was coming into his eye in James and Corcoran, the changes are against, rather than in favor of, his having left the punctuation of any given line intact.<sup>3</sup>

REPRODUCED FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT OF THE FIRST EDITION OF THE

<sup>1</sup>See p. 45, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>See list.

<sup>3</sup>As we shall see, Corcoran I changed the copy punctuation in more than 50 per cent of his lines in the two pages he set of James and Corcoran.



Variants in Cyballig (continued)

2.           all                               up  
                                              by

The corrected passage reads:

Textum. I will wage against your wold, wold  
to 18; by thing I hadde done on up  
dayen, "the part of 18.

Now it seems likely that the change to upper case "W" was made  
for the same reason that we would correct for such a change after  
a full stop, namely that a small letter was changed to a capital  
to begin a new sentence, even though the mark of punctuation which  
divides the two independent clauses is here a colon and not a  
period and was allowed to stand.<sup>1</sup>

Or possibly the change from colon to period was called for but  
not made.

3. and {178} and  
      Comp. 2                               and,  
                                              and  
  
4.           all                               such  
                                              such,  
  
5.           all                               such.  
                                              such?

The passage which contains the preceding three variants reads in  
the corrected states

<sup>1</sup> See notes 1 and 3, p. 18.

Verbalize in Quadrangle (continued)

That are one and! High Nature gives them open  
To see this wondrous Ark, and the ship Crip  
Of one and land, which was distinguished 'twixt  
The Earth's Ocean above, and the realm's d' below  
From the water's d' beach, and can we not  
Partition seas with spectacles as previous  
Tides' dunes, and dunes?

Ans. What about your punctuation?

The introduction of the comma after "beach" makes more obvious  
the end of one independent clause and the beginning of another,  
and, once again, the rhetorical questions which are followed by  
a period in the first state have a question mark in the second.  
All these changes make for greater syntactic clarity.

6.            Ans                                 Ans<sup>1</sup>  
                                                     Ans

The corrected passage reads:

Quil                                 In Fortune  
The whole night from him; while the belly belated,  
Over looks I cannot imagine from's from longer after oh,  
Can up alone hold, to think that was the house  
By Memory, Report, or his own proof  
That would be, yet that the cannot change  
But mark for still's from longer impious!  
For needed language!

It is strange that this difficult and strongly punctuated passage,  
written with talent, should not have attracted the reader's notice  
further than inserting a comma after "be," and he may not even have  
intended that. It is possible that his only correction was to de-  
lete the quad mark, with the compositor adding the double colon  
subsequently.

---

<sup>1</sup> quad mark. The colon in the corrected state is on double one.

THESE IN ITALIAN (continued)

7. 141

your <sup>1</sup> but  
your we but

The corrected passage reads:

Eng. . . . Why do you play me?  
Ital. That whom do,  
O you about to say? why your we but  
It is an effort of the Gods to reach it,  
But time to speak we't.

A nice piece of evidence pointing towards the use of other pronouns about as we almost inevitably use the dash which the reader supplied, i.e. to indicate the uncompleted sentence, the abandonment of old system and the beginning of new. Whether the fact that the colon is an Italian one is significant or not in this connection might also be investigated.

8. 142 (XII) 142  
Comp. 8

these,  
these

The passage reads (in the corrected state):

Eng. My love, I these  
The longest distance.  
Ital. And therefore, not I  
Belie'd to this intelligence, pronounce  
The journey of his changes but <sup>1</sup> the your comes  
That from my robust consciousness, to my tongue  
Shames this report out.

Shame's note reads:

Since a comma is wanted after "these" in line 2 one will use either "I" in line 11, perhaps, and change the comma

---

<sup>1</sup> to Italian colon.

Parsons in Controlling Government

after "blameful" in line 11 might or be replaced by a period-plus-capital (or at least a comma, or after "change" in line 13), the sound of the name after "four" . . . looks rather like a mispronunciation by the composer. But the reader does not have to be at fault.<sup>1</sup>

1. and(215/216)

designer!  
designer,

The line is the corrected state reader:

With line of income over that. Not up design.

Each line is here looking at the sleeping design; a description of her eyes only at the line. The meaning is clear enough. The question mark may have been intended to convey "But what of my design?" or "But am I up design?" In any case or true later-negative is meant.

10. and(211/212)  
Comp. B

Let us see-and and  
Let us see-and and

The proof-reader corrected by removing the hyphen.

11. and

What is . . . .  
What is . . . .<sup>2</sup>

The corrected state reader

and by<sup>3</sup> to<sup>4</sup> my<sup>5</sup>  
Tell us how when you make me happy, or I<sup>6</sup>  
I<sup>7</sup> believe such a name.

<sup>1</sup>1. 210.

<sup>2</sup>2. space quad mark.

<sup>3</sup>3. Again the spectrograph after "up." See pp. 43-54.

<sup>4</sup>4. space quad mark.

Thus again:

Then the abbreviation colon after "Salus" was raised from line 25B = 1. 1. The line was evidently heightened up again by the insertion of a space quad in the white space at the end of the line, after "an". But this type was not pushed down as it should have been and as fact fact.<sup>1</sup>

### Summary Comment

In studying the preceding variants we have been concerned to observe the attitude of the proof-reader. Although we have taken a few side glances at the uncorrected state and have been constrained to speculate about whether the compositor's punctuation was in his copy or not, these speculations were relevant mostly to the proper delineation of the nature of the proof-reader's action in a particular case. For example, when a comma that existed in the uncorrected state had no stylistic function but is suggestive of a kind of reading which might account for its having been in the compositor's copy, and we observe that the proof-reader nevertheless rashly expunged it, his attitude towards non-syntactic punctuation is exhibited whether the comma was in the compositor's copy or not, since we know that as a rule the proof-reader did not consult copy for his changes, and that, moreover, he would almost certainly not have kept a comma to disapproval of in copy any more than the compositor did. Since maintaining fidelity to copy was not the function of proof-reading, precisely the question in the proof-reader's mind was not whether the comma was in copy or was not in copy but whether

<sup>1</sup> 1. 215.

or not the name ought to be printed in the title. In the case of Intense and Chastity variant 4, for example, the decision of the proof-reader was that it ought not. Since that was his decision, and in this particular place we are certain of it since the proof-sheet is correct and the intention is clear, it is our duty to speculate upon the reasons for his decision. The most likely one is that the name is unsatisfactory. It not only serves no useful stylistic purpose; it breaks in upon the system in a destructive way. That it might have deliberately been placed there in order to do this and to convey meaning unaccompanied by any other name does not seem to convince the proof-reader. There is a perfectly acceptable meaning, the propositional meaning of the speech as it stands, that nobody could possibly object to. The name, though it might delight the few who took it for a poem in the cottage, would be easier to the general who might take it for incompetence in the print shop. The decision, then, would seem to be a conformity to some recognizable standard of suitability which the Folio buyers would be certain to notice the lack of, as they would be certain to notice typographical errors.

When an attempt is made at the standard of suitability in pronunciation, we can hardly fail to notice that it seems to depend in the proof-reader's mind on the acknowledgment of the structural relationships of words to the rest of the sentence, in other words, on syntax. And the type of convention by which syntax is defined, emphasized, or affected does not seem to be very different from that of a prescriptive grammar.

like Bart's in the 14th century or of Cooper's<sup>1</sup> in the 17th or a style sheet of our own time. The conventions themselves often seem identical with those cited by Bart, as, for example, in Jaeger and Glarung variant 7; sometimes identical with those of our own day, as, for example, in The Bookman of Tappa variant 1; and sometimes an even more or less convention previously unfamiliar to us as, for example, the comma which seems to precede the report of a thought or statement.

Apart from the purely typographical errors like, for example, the capitalization sometimes righted as in The Bookman of Tappa variant 1, of which there are none right, Jaeger Glarung variant 1, Jaeger and Glarung variants 1, 3, 4, and 7, and Quadrangle variants 1 and 12, there are those purely conventional normalizing changes, as in period after speech heads (see character attachments), as Jaeger and Glarung variant 4, Jaeger Glarung variant 1, and Quadrangle variant 12, which raise the number of changes as shown that were, in a sense, automatic or forced upon the proof-readers by their visual appearances.

This leaves twenty-two that were thought worth resetting type for as more than proofs. Of these the absence of question marks after question marks has an additional eight. The Bookman of Tappa variants 3 and 4, In The Like Is variant 1, Jaeger TII variants 1 and 2, Jaeger Glarung variant 1, and Quadrangle variants 2 and 3, and the spacing of question marks where there is neither question nor "voluntary interregative,"<sup>2</sup> for the most, Jaeger and Glarung variant 1 and

<sup>1</sup>See p. 14, notes 3 and 4.

<sup>2</sup>See discussion of Jaeger variant 1, p. 11ff.

Combining variant 3. This still leaves twelve punctuation changes which being neither typographical nor merely conventional have to do with our phrasing, or even (as in The Continuum of Japan, variants 4) defining structural relationships. These, for no more obvious consideration than clarity of meaning, were thought worth making. In addition, there are the five changes connected to typographical errors (Chūjō Japan, variant 3, Japan and Japanese, variants 3, 5, and 7, and Combining variant 3) which might, if it were, not have been made were it not for the necessity of resetting the typeset matter in the line, but were thought nevertheless for the structural benefit, and just the kind had also in the proof-reader's attention.

In a way, the last consideration seems the key to the matter. It is not that there were not hundreds of occasions on which the proof-reader might have changed the composer's punctuation had he been more correct, or had the letters, to do so. The printer is full of images exactly like those the reader deplores. He absolutely had no stomach to improve every page, had even when he had a page under consideration he was concerned solely with the facts of printing and obvious branches of correction like the answer of a question mark in an interrogative sentence.

Yet he had ideas about the propriety of the various marks of punctuation and their absence, and under certain conditions he exercised his authority on their behalf. The proof-reading was sparse, critical, and busy, but above all active it shows a consistent bias in favor of the use of punctuation for the purpose of the clarification of proposi-



liberal meaning and, as we have shown in the details of the commentary, an indifference to other considerations and other levels of meaning.

That the particular marks of punctuation were and the recipients of their preferences, whether conventional or individual, is a less certain matter and has been dealt with at length in a spirit of inquiry in the commentary, but the general proposition seems to have indisputable force that.

To ascertain the basis of the proof-reader's bias, however, requires only if he may be always the same one, as Dr. Heman suggests, and there is here, presumably, perhaps, a personal rather than an official bias, is a far cry from assuming that this basis was general either of the age or even of the Jaggard establishment. If we wish to compare the proof-reader's attitude towards punctuation with that of the compositor, we must first find out independent evidence of the compositor's attitude. And just as we have taken evidence on the subject of the proof-reader's transfer from of the proof sheet given him by the compositor, we must now find a way to gather evidence on the relationship between what the compositor set and his copy.

If in the next group of plays, those for which Quarto copy has been postulated by Craig and others, there were no difficulties or ambiguities about the relationship between Quarto and Folio, we could ascertain the compositor's attitude towards punctuation by the same procedure we used for examining uncorrected and corrected copy in order to determine the proof-reader's attitude. That is, just as we now assume that what the proof-reader found was the first state of the Folio and what he changed

In the textual stage of the Folio, we might assume that what the copy-painter found was the Quarto and what he changed to was the first stage of the Folio. For this assumption to be possible, however, we must be fairly certain that the Quarto was indeed copy for the Folio composition. But, as will yet be seen, the preservation of Quarto copy is conditioned to a great extent for the Folio text. In every play except one, supplementary material must be preserved as copy. In that case though a Quarto might be the basic copy, in any particular place we cannot be sure whether it was or not. In fact, a good part of our commentary for most of the plays which follow will be taken up with this very question and the uncertainties in evidence for the purposes of particular analysis.

It will be obvious, then, that it is only in the one play which is exempt from these uncertainties that we can find a firm place from which to gather evidence about the relationship of the composer to his copy. That play is Henry and Julius.

We shall, therefore, take time out from the Roman sections to study the preservation of some pages of the Folio Henry and Julius and compare it with the preservation of those parts of the 1609 Quarto which served as copy for it.

Even though as two compositions are compared, B and R, we shall be able to ascertain not only whether there is any consistency in William's preservation on the part of a given composer, but whether one composer differed in any essential way from another.

The methodology of this study, as well as its results, will be set out in the next section.

## CHAPTER III

### COMPOSITE<sup>1</sup> ATTEMPTS TOWARD RECONSTRUCTION: A STUDY OF THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE TREATMENT OF QUANTS COST IN THE COMPOSITE IN THE SERVICE OF IGNON AND JULIET

#### IN RECONSTRUCTION OF $I^2$ 's AND $I^1$ 's TREATMENT OF QUANTS COST IN IGNON AND JULIET

In the reconstruction of Ignon and Juliet we have a unique situation, inasmuch as it is the only play thought to be lost exclusively from copy which is available to us, namely the 1609 Quarto.<sup>1</sup> The particular copy of the Quarto which was used in Jaggard's print may very, of course, have been variant from the original of the Folger Facsimile we are using for our study,<sup>2</sup> but since the values used in the setting of things in statistical in any case, any value it may have should not be such as to be gained.

None of the Folger Ignon and Juliet has been identified by Charles Blount as having been set by Christopher B., but the first and last pages were set by B. It is these two pages that give us our unique opportunity of comparing her two different compositions inherent with station copy.  $I^2$ 's two pages show a consistency of treatment, as do the first 2 pages as have shown it random for comparison with them.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The First Facsimile and Facsimile Transcription of Ignon and Juliet (London, Printed for John Macmillan, 1901), Folger Facsimile of 1609.

<sup>2</sup>There are seven known variant copies of the Quarto which have not as yet been collated.

<sup>3</sup>It is worth noting that in page 1609, the sum of the first of  $I^2$ 's pages included here which was proof-read, he shows no difference of

What has been done is to note the punctuation changes from copy, separating the treatment of speech headings and the punctuation at the end of stage directions, which as remarks were always expected to be superfluous to practice, from all other marks of punctuation, whose the former would be automatic and serve as an indication of awkwardness and errors copy, and the latter would be a matter of deliberation. The data for each of the seven pages are given in turn and comparative tables are given at the end.

For each comparison and for each page several ratios are given. The ratio of omission is the relationship between the number of cases of omissions, cases of Quarto marks of punctuation omitted in the Folio and not replaced (in the given place) by any other mark of punctuation, and the total number of cases of punctuation change. The ratio of addition is the relationship between the number of cases of addition, cases of marks of punctuation in the Folio where no punctuation mark appeared in the Quarto, and the total number of cases of punctuation change. The ratio of alteration is the relationship between the cases of alteration, cases of substitution of one mark of punctuation in the Folio in a place where another mark of punctuation change. The total number of cases of

punctuation pattern from that in the other does, which may be presumed not to have been proof-read because they could be only too stark. It suggests that the possibility of P's having given special treatment to pages for which he anticipated proof-reading is unlikely, though, of course, neither the possibility that there had been an anticipation of proof-reading which was failed to materialize nor even the bare likely possibility that a page had been proof-read and not corrected may be entirely ruled out. In the case of P's two pages the same consistency of pattern exists between act, the first page of *Henry and Arthur* for which there are two states and, therefore, for which proof-reading may be postulated (within the only variant is the removal of an initial *quod*) (Q, 291), and the last page, 292, which shows no evidence of having been proof-read.

series of punctuation in the Folio where no punctuation mark appeared in the Quarto, and the total number of cases of punctuation change. The ratio of alteration is the relationship between the cases of alteration, cases of substitution of one mark of punctuation in the Folio in a place where another mark of punctuation appears in the Quarto, and the total number of cases of punctuation change. The total number of cases of punctuation change are the numbers of cases of omission, of addition, and of alteration added together. The Inconstancy Ratio is the relationship between the number of times an orthographically punctuated speech heading or stage direction in the Quarto (and not followed by a period) was allowed to remain in the Folio and the total number of such unorthodox Quarto punctuations. We call this Inconstancy because the intention would be to find them and change them. The Inaccuracy Ratio is the relationship between the number of times unorthodox punctuations appears in speech headings and stage directions in the Folio where the Quarto has normal punctuation (i.e., a period). We call this a measure of inaccuracy where the intention would be to keep this punctuation.

The usefulness of both these ratios is that they measure how much we must allow for compositor negligence, ratios of Inconstancy or of Inaccuracy, in carrying out intention where we are aware with virtual certainty what the intention is. We can then judge how far we may deduce intention from performance in other cases where we do not know what the intention is.

The nature of the other ratios is self-evident.

TABLE 1

| 1. Folio page no(XI)<br>Comp. 5                                                         | Copy: (pages 42 1.1<br>to 48 1.3) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Number of lines with Punctuation Changes <sup>1</sup><br>(vol. 28 lines, vol. 29 lines) | 50                                |
| Number of lines on Folio Page<br>(vol. 44 lines, vol. 5 of lines)                       | 98                                |
| Ratio (28/98)                                                                           | 28.57                             |
| Number of Cases of Deletion                                                             | 7                                 |
| Number of Cases of Addition                                                             | 28                                |
| Number of Cases of Alteration                                                           | 25                                |
| Total Number of Punctuation Changes                                                     | 60                                |
| Ratio of Deletion (7/60)                                                                | 11.67                             |
| Ratio of Addition (28/60)                                                               | 46.67                             |
| Ratio of Alteration (25/60)                                                             | 41.67                             |
| Exhaustiveness Ratio                                                                    | 0.95                              |
| Intensity Ratio                                                                         | 1.45                              |

<sup>1</sup>Of the lines that show punctuation change a1, a2, a3, a4, a5, a6, a7, a8, a9, a10, a11, a12, a13, and a14 have been changed with the changes: a1 and a14, these changes. Hence the total number of cases of change is fifteen more than the number of lines changed.

TABLE 3

| 2. Folio page no/34)<br>Comp. 8                                                            | Copy: Quarter page 34 1,34<br>no 32 1,34 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Number of lines with Punctuation Changes <sup>1</sup><br>(only a 15 lines, not a 15 lines) | 33                                       |
| Number of lines on Folio Page<br>(only a 46 lines, not a 46 lines)                         | 131                                      |
| Ratio (33/131)                                                                             | 25.2%                                    |
| Number of Cases of Deletion                                                                | 3                                        |
| Number of Cases of Addition                                                                | 13                                       |
| Number of Cases of Alteration                                                              | 17                                       |
| Total Number of Punctuation Changes                                                        | 33                                       |
| Ratio of Deletion (3/33)                                                                   | 9.1%                                     |
| Ratio of Addition (13/33)                                                                  | 39.4%                                    |
| Ratio of Alteration (17/33)                                                                | 51.5%                                    |
| Redundancy Ratio                                                                           | 0.0%                                     |
| Emergency Ratio                                                                            | 3.0%                                     |

<sup>1</sup> Lines a 25, 32, and 34 have been changed with two changes.

TABLE 4

| 3. Folio page code (H)                                                                   | Copy: Quarter pages 11 1.17<br>to 10 1.21 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Number of lines with punctuation changes <sup>1</sup><br>(col. 1 lines, col. 2 11 lines) | 21                                        |
| Number of lines on Folio Page<br>(col. 1 44 lines, col. 2 44 lines)                      | 128                                       |
| ratio (21/128)                                                                           | 16.4%                                     |
| Number of Cases of Deletion                                                              | 3                                         |
| Number of Cases of Addition                                                              | 4                                         |
| Number of Cases of Alteration                                                            | 12                                        |
| Total Number of Punctuation Changes                                                      | 19                                        |
| Ratio of Deletion (3/12)                                                                 | 25.0%                                     |
| Ratio of Addition (4/12)                                                                 | 33.3%                                     |
| Ratio of Alteration (12/12)                                                              | 100.0%                                    |
| Interchangeability Ratio                                                                 | 0.0%                                      |
| Interchangeability Ratio                                                                 | 0.0%                                      |

<sup>1</sup> Lines 1-17 have been changed with 1st punctuation changes.



TABLE 2

| 4. Folio page 113 (117)<br>Comp. 2                                                          | Copys | Quarto pages 13 1.14<br>to 14 1.24 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|
| Number of lines with Punctuation Changes <sup>1</sup><br>(col. a 11 lines, col. b 11 lines) |       | 22                                 |
| Number of lines on Folio Page<br>(col. a 88 lines, col. b 84 lines)                         |       | 112                                |
| Ratio (22/112)                                                                              |       | 24.71                              |
| Number of Cases of Deletion                                                                 |       | 3                                  |
| Number of Cases of Addition                                                                 |       | 14                                 |
| Number of Cases of Alteration                                                               |       | 22                                 |
| Total Number of Punctuation Changes                                                         |       | 39                                 |
| Ratio of Deletion (3/39)                                                                    |       | 7.69                               |
| Ratio of Addition (14/39)                                                                   |       | 35.90                              |
| Ratio of Alteration (22/39)                                                                 |       | 56.41                              |
| Indeterminateness Ratio                                                                     |       | 8.01 <sup>2</sup>                  |
| Supervisory Ratio                                                                           |       | 8.01                               |

<sup>1</sup>Lines 103, 105, 106, and 107 have been changed with two punctuation changes, 101 with three changes.

<sup>2</sup>See p. 73, n. 2.

TABLE 4

| 5. Folio page 101v(11)<br>Comp. 8                                                       | Capps (page 101 in 11 L.35<br>in 12 L.31) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Number of Lines with Punctuation Changes <sup>1</sup><br>(only 11 lines, only 11 lines) | 32                                        |
| Number of Lines on Folio Page<br>(only 15 lines, only 15 lines)                         | 128                                       |
| Ratio (11/128)                                                                          | 8.6%                                      |
| Number of Cases of Omission                                                             | 4                                         |
| Number of Cases of Addition                                                             | 11                                        |
| Number of Cases of Alteration                                                           | 15                                        |
| Total Number of Punctuation Changes                                                     | 30                                        |
| Ratio of Omission (4/30)                                                                | 13.3%                                     |
| Ratio of Addition (11/30)                                                               | 36.7%                                     |
| Ratio of Alteration (15/30)                                                             | 50.0%                                     |
| Insufficientness Ratio                                                                  | 5.0%                                      |
| Excessiveness Ratio                                                                     | 1.6%                                      |

<sup>1</sup>101v, 102v, and 103 have been changed with the punctuation changes, 102 and 103, with three changes.

TABLE 7

| 4. Folio page no/200<br>Comp. 8                                                           | Copy: Quatre pages 120 1,2<br>de XL 1,12 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Number of lines with Punctuation Changes <sup>2</sup><br>(vols. 24 lines, vols. 25 lines) | 27                                       |
| Number of lines on Folio page<br>(vols. 24 lines, vols. 25 lines)                         | 127                                      |
| Ratio (27/127)                                                                            | 21.26                                    |
| Number of Lines of Deletion                                                               | 5                                        |
| Number of Lines of Addition                                                               | 26                                       |
| Number of Lines of Alteration                                                             | 22                                       |
| Total Number of Punctuation Changes                                                       | 53                                       |
| Ratio of Deletion (5/51)                                                                  | 9.80                                     |
| Ratio of Addition (26/51)                                                                 | 50.98                                    |
| Ratio of Alteration (22/51)                                                               | 43.14                                    |
| Institutional Ratio                                                                       | 5.05                                     |
| Inventory Ratio                                                                           | 5.05                                     |

<sup>2</sup>Lines 24, 25, 26, and 127 have been changed with the punctuation changes.

TABLE 1

| F. Folio pages 42b(77)<br>Comp. 2                                                           | Days | Quarto pages 62 L.16<br>to end of quarto |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------------------------------------------|
| Number of Lines with Punctuation Changes <sup>1</sup><br>(incl.a 22 lines, incl.b 18 lines) |      | 48                                       |
| Number of Lines on Folio Page<br>(incl.a 28 lines, incl.b 28 lines)                         |      | 78                                       |
| Ratio (48/78)                                                                               |      | 61.5%                                    |
| Number of Cases of Deletion                                                                 |      | 4                                        |
| Number of Cases of Addition                                                                 |      | 26                                       |
| Number of Cases of Alteration                                                               |      | 22                                       |
| Total Number of Punctuation Changes                                                         |      | 52                                       |
| Ratio of Deletion (4/78)                                                                    |      | 5%                                       |
| Ratio of Addition (26/78)                                                                   |      | 44%                                      |
| Ratio of Alteration (22/78)                                                                 |      | 44%                                      |
| Institutiveness Ratio                                                                       |      | 8.7%                                     |
| Summary Ratio                                                                               |      | 15.7%                                    |

<sup>1</sup> Lines a12, a13, a26, a31, a32, b1, b12, and b18 have been changed with two changes, a14, with three changes.

TABLE 9

Table of Areas with Penetration Changes in Total Budget of Japan  
in Fiscal Year 1991

|                          |         |       |
|--------------------------|---------|-------|
| Folio page $\omega_1(C)$ | (56/70) | 56.71 |
| Folio page $\omega_2(C)$ | (56/70) | 56.71 |
| Totals                   | (56/70) | 56.71 |

Table of Areas with Penetration Changes in Total Budget of Japan  
in Fiscal Year 1991

|                          |          |       |
|--------------------------|----------|-------|
| Folio page $\omega_1(C)$ | (51/120) | 51.67 |
| Folio page $\omega_2(C)$ | (51/120) | 51.67 |
| Folio page $\omega_3(C)$ | (51/120) | 51.67 |
| Folio page $\omega_4(C)$ | (51/120) | 51.67 |
| Folio page $\omega_5(C)$ | (51/120) | 51.67 |
| Totals                   | (51/120) | 51.67 |

Table 18

Ratio of Cases of Deletion, of Addition, and of Alteration  
to Total Number of Nucleotide Changes on Page Set No. 2

|                     | Ratio of<br>Deletion | Ratio of<br>Addition | Ratio of<br>Alteration |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Folio page 260(310) | 14.7% (7/48)         | 44.7% (22/49)        | 40.7% (21/52)          |
| Folio page 260(390) | 9.7% (6/62)          | 44.7% (24/54)        | 44.7% (23/52)          |
| Totals              | 9.7% (13/133)        | 44.7% (35/117)       | 45.7% (35/117)         |

Ratio of Cases of Deletion, of Addition, and of Alteration  
to Total Number of Nucleotide Changes on Page Set No. 3

|                      | Ratio of<br>Deletion | Ratio of<br>Addition | Ratio of<br>Alteration |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Folio page 260e(340) | 14.7% (3/21)         | 37.7% (13/35)        | 44.7% (15/34)          |
| Folio page 260e(390) | 13.7% (3/22)         | 39.7% (16/41)        | 39.7% (15/38)          |
| Folio page 262(390)  | 8.7% (3/35)          | 39.7% (16/41)        | 35.7% (20/56)          |
| Folio page 266e(70)  | 14.7% (6/41)         | 39.7% (11/28)        | 44.7% (24/54)          |
| Folio page 270e(70)  | 14.7% (3/21)         | 44.7% (14/31)        | 34.7% (13/38)          |
| Totals               | 13.7% (19/139)       | 38.7% (58/150)       | 38.7% (59/153)         |

Table 11

Conventional Transcriptions

|                             | Number of Cases<br>of Unnormalized<br>Copy in Quarto <sup>1</sup> | Number of Cases of<br>Unnormalized Copy<br>Preserved in Folio | Number-<br>circum-<br>stances |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>Conventions 1</u>        |                                                                   |                                                               |                               |
| Folio page <i>xxiv</i> (24) | 2                                                                 | 0                                                             | 0                             |
| Folio page <i>xxi</i> (21)  | 1                                                                 | 0                                                             | 0                             |
| <u>Conventions 2</u>        |                                                                   |                                                               |                               |
| Folio page <i>xxiv</i> (24) | 2                                                                 | 0                                                             | 0                             |
| Folio page <i>xxiv</i> (24) | 0                                                                 | 0                                                             | 0                             |
| Folio page <i>xxi</i> (21)  | 0                                                                 | 0 <sup>2</sup>                                                | 0                             |
| Folio page <i>xxiv</i> (24) | 2                                                                 | 0                                                             | 0                             |
| Folio page <i>xxiv</i> (24) | 1                                                                 | 0                                                             | 0                             |

<sup>1</sup>Spaced headings and stage directions without final periods.<sup>2</sup>The unnormalized copy in the Quarto was preserved in the Folio; however, it should be noted that a error in the Quarto was corrected in a folio in the Folio. Although it is a misprint was made to correct, the error is one of inaccuracy in carrying out intention rather than intention in copy.

TABLE 12  
Continental Insurance

|                       | Number of<br>Expectations <sup>1</sup> | Number of Cases<br>of Failure to Keep<br>General Position | Recovery<br>Ratio |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| <u>Continental A.</u> |                                        |                                                           |                   |
| Falls page 642(11)    | 20                                     | 1                                                         | 3.0%              |
| Falls page 641(17)    | 9                                      | 1                                                         | 11.1%             |
| Totals                | 40                                     | 2                                                         | 4.4%              |
| <u>Continental B.</u> |                                        |                                                           |                   |
| Falls page 642a(34)   | 30                                     | 2                                                         | 6.7%              |
| Falls page 642a(44)   | 43                                     | 2                                                         | 4.7%              |
| Falls page 642b(44)   | 42                                     | 0                                                         | 0.0%              |
| Falls page 642b(72)   | 32                                     | 1                                                         | 3.1%              |
| Falls page 642b(74)   | 43                                     | 0                                                         | 0.0%              |
| Totals                | 190                                    | 5                                                         | 2.6%              |

<sup>1</sup>Total number of speech headings and stage directions not observed in copy.



### Analysis of Tables

It at once became apparent that the respondents sometimes use the punctuation they found in their copy and sometimes not. That they did not ignore punctuation is evident from the fact that where there was a rigid convention to be followed, as in having a period after speech headings, they invariably changed copy in all but one case. And the fact that their inaccuracy ratios are only 5 1/2 per cent and 4 1/2 per cent respectively (Table 12) gives us no reason to suppose that they were less careful with punctuation than with any other type of the line.

It is furthermore apparent that I changed the punctuation in more than half the lines in one, 70 out of 130, and I (in one sample) changed the punctuation in only about one-fifth the number of lines in one, 34 out of 130 (Table 13).

However, we are fairly certain that these averages are not the result of scratch ups and down; i.e., a great copy change on one page sets up five or six five changes in another page. Both comparisons show a very small deviation from their overall percentage on any given page.

In P's case, for example, his overall percentage of changed lines is 11.75 (Table 14), while his two pages show ratios of 11.3 per cent (Table 15)<sup>1</sup> and 14.3 per cent (Table 16), the former 1.5 per cent less than the overall percentage the latter 1.5 per cent more than the overall percentage, an average deviation, then, of 1 1/2 per cent from average rate.

---

<sup>1</sup>Tables cited was the original tables where the data may be found in detail, but cumulative Tables 9 and 10 may also be consulted.

In  $P$ 's case, again, his overall percentage of changed lines is 27.1 per cent (Table 7), while the lowest percentage of changed lines on any one page is 26.4 per cent (Table 4) and his highest, 30.1 per cent (Table 6). Again the average deviation covering all five pages is low.

That this means is that both  $E$  and  $P$  show a high degree of consistency in their treatment of punctuation. In that if we cross across a page that we know was not by  $E$  as by  $P$  we know that the probability is of any line's punctuation having been tampered with. In  $P$ 's case the chances are better than even that it has; in  $E$ 's case, in roughly only one line out of five, while in roughly four lines out of five we have *no* punctuation. Therefore, in the case of  $E$  the burden of proof still falls on anyone the disputes the punctuation's origin as copy. In  $P$ 's case the burden of proof falls on anyone who assumes the punctuation's origin as copy.

To reduce the matter still further and to consider how far we are justified in assuming deliberate intention and a rational purpose in change, we may use the *hierarchy* rule and assume that since  $P$ 's was 4.4 per cent (Table 10), only about 4 1/2 per cent of the changes are accidental and about 90 per cent deliberate; in  $E$ 's case, since his *hierarchy* factor is only 3.4 per cent (Table 10), that roughly 37 per cent of his changes were deliberate. Thus we talk about them, then, *as* things being equal, we must assume a deliberation and purpose. The *hierarchy* factor is so low that it may be ignored altogether (Table 10).

As is evident from the tables, the total number of punctuation changes on a page is often greater than the number of lines changed (Tables 3-6). This is simply because more lines have more than one

changes. And again I look in the matter of changes per line. Not only does he have many more changed lines than I, but he makes a greater number of changes. On one page I change forty lines and make up with fifty changes (Table 11). On his other page he changes fifty lines with sixty-five changes (Table 12). In P's pages we read thirty-two lines changes with thirty-five total changes; twenty-one lines changed, twenty-two changes (i.e. only one line with two changes, none with more); thirty-two lines, thirty-eight changes; thirty-two, thirty-nine; and twenty-seven, thirty-one (Tables 13-15).

It is the matter of the total number of changes of any given type of change that have been converted to percentages. So in Table 1. The ratio of addition 1/31 has been converted to a percentage, 15.4 per cent. This means that of the sixty-five changes I make, about 15 per cent were additions. This leaves roughly 49 per cent; of this remainder roughly half were changes of addition and half of alterations. The three figures, of course, add up to 100 per cent, which represents all the sixty-five cases of punctuation change.

Now we study and compare P's and E's cumulative tables (Table 16) we again note the high degree of consistency all around.

In both E and I the narrow kind of change is the omission of a mark of punctuation.<sup>1</sup> Of all E's changes this represents less than 10 per cent (Table 16). Of all I's changes it represents about 21 per cent (Table 16). In a line that we have not changed, then, if we find a place with-

<sup>1</sup>See Table 18.

not punctuation the chances against there having been a mark in copy is about nine to one. In a plain table of randoms, considering all the lines that were not changed at all, the chance of a mark having been in copy where none appears in the Folio would be much greater than that. The exact probability against this would depend not only on that percentage of a compositor's changes are omissions, but on that percentage of lines he changed, as well as on the number of changes he averaged per line. The exact probability would, therefore, be very different for a page set by B from that on a page set by D. Without an exact mathematical formula let us venture to guess that in D's page the chances against there having been a mark in his copy where he has none right is about eighteen to one; in D's page the chances against it might be about thirty-five to one.

In another case it is obvious that the working hypothesis that an absence of punctuation in the Folio probably indicates an absence in copy is sound. The burden of proof is overwhelmingly on anyone who says the reverse.

About the other case, where there is a mark of punctuation in the Folio, the probabilities require a closer consideration.

Of D's total number of changes 45.2 per cent are additions, and exactly the same percentage, 45.2 per cent, are omissions (Table 20). In other words, then we find a punctuation mark that in D's text contributes to the Folio, exactly half the time there will have been nothing in his copy, and half the time a different mark of punctuation in his copy. What does this mean about a particular time of D's setting? We know that he changed the punctuation in more lines than he left unchanged. In any

given line, there is, then, a presumption of change. If there is only one mark of punctuation on the line the chances are a shade in favor of P's having put it there, with the chance of there having been a mark in copy about equal with that of there having been none. This estimate is a crude approximation, of course, leaving out of the reckoning any factors which in a strict statistical formula would have to be taken into account. Nevertheless, it will be obvious that there is no overwhelming probability either way.

In P's case the matter stands quite differently. If we find a mark of punctuation that I contributed to the Folio, the chances are greater that it represents an alteration of some mark already in his copy than that he added a mark when there was none. His rate of adding being only 10.1 per cent, of alterations, 11 per cent (Table IV). And when I changed only a fifth of his lines he began with and the chance that he added a mark in those is one in three, the chance in something like one in fifteen that he added a mark in any line taken at random.

All of P's ratios tend to confirm the fact that he was timid about altering copy. Since the alteration of a mark does have violence to copy then the addition of a mark, it is consistent that he should be more likely to alter than to add.

To the question what kinds of alterations were made by each copy writer, and to what purpose, we are not yet ready to give a "quantified" response, if indeed we ever shall be.

But it is to this very question that we shall address ourselves in the pages that follow, in a tentative spirit, one by one, in the order

that come to our attention. We shall see how the proof-reader and the compositor combined and how they differ. And the only play which we can do this without having to question our very premises, namely that what we are calling gag is indeed gag, is the very first one we consider, Love and Jealousy itself.

## CHAPTER IV

### A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CONSONANTS AND PLOP-ASSOCIATED PUNCTUATION IN EGYPTIAN PARCHMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE EGYPTIAN PARCHMENT WITH QUARTZ COPY IN SEVEN PLAYS PREPARED BY HAROLD DE HAAS FOR QUARTZ

#### Inclusion in *Haas and Jullien*

Haas and Jullien is believed to have been set from the 1919 reprint of the good Quartz of 1899 without reference to any manuscript for correction.<sup>1</sup> It is therefore an unusually fine place from which to survey the relation between the Haas variants and the copy text. The only risk we run here is that the Quartz copy used for the *Haas* might itself be worked in the crucial place, and the *Haas* on that account different from the Quartz which we happen to be examining.<sup>2</sup>

The pages that show punctuation variants are:<sup>3</sup>

1. *cdw*(26) == Consonant E
2. *cdw*(55) == Consonant E
3. *cdw*(56) == Consonant E
4. *cdw*(61) == Consonant E
5. *cdw*(74) == Consonant E<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>In everything to such play the nature of the copy from which it was set I am, of course, following *Comp.* Occasionally I cite the lower classings for a particular option, but only if I have space! (continued in.) W. B. Gray, *The Hieroglyphic Texts of the Pyramid* (Oxford, 1913). Sometimes comparison is made with the earlier work! W. B. Gray, *The Hieroglyphic Texts of the Pyramid*, a Survey of the Foundations of the Text (Oxford, 1914).

<sup>2</sup>*The First Egyptian and Assyrian Texts of Haas and Jullien* (London, Printed for John Bartholomew, 1917). Folger Institute, N.Y., 1917.

<sup>3</sup>*I*, 1913.

<sup>4</sup>Although Dr. Haas does not actually state the point, it is his analysis of E's work which enables us to conclude that it was very likely

Verdicts in James and Julia (continued)

1. act(18)al Q 10 1.4

down,  
down,  
down

The corrected Julia passage reads:

Should in the farthest East begin to draw  
The shuttle curtains from James bed,

The correction is in the direction of modern conventions;  
the reader has removed the comma which separates verb from  
object,

1. 103 Q 10 1.15

down in  
down in  
down, in

The passage reads in the Quarto:

James. A right faire murther faire down in comes his.  
Companion E, as he usually did, delivered the copy. The  
reviser, perhaps, chose to recognize the mistake by  
placing a comma after it, in the way noted by Simpson as  
frequent.<sup>1</sup>

1. act(18)al Q 10 1.25

Comp. E

down, slowly  
down, slowly  
down, slowly

previously because James and Julia was not entirely free printed text  
that I was allowed to try the whole of it (except for the first and last  
pages which contain many words). On looking at it another way, the fact  
that I was allowed all of James and Julia in another place of evidence,  
if any were needed, leading to confirm that the play was indeed set wholly  
from the Quarto.

<sup>1</sup>See pp. 7-8.



Verbalize in Image and Feeling (continued)

The passage reads in the Quarto:

She is too fair, too wise, wholly too fair,  
To merit blame by making us disparage:

Note that in the revised state of the Folio a wider space occurs between the colon and the lecture on each side of it than in the first state. That is the only change.

Notes, comments:

The colon of uncorrected F . . . needed to be put before rather than after the word "at" -- and a space added between it and the p. But Compositors it seems to have misinterpreted the reader's directions . . . for to put word spaces before and after the colon, yet to left the colon itself there in use.<sup>1</sup>

From the point of view of this study the interesting question is what prompted  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , who evidently made fewer changes in his copy than  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , to change the sense of the Quarto to a colon in the Folio, for whatever colon he may have done, or failed to do, I think we may accept that as his single intention.<sup>2</sup> Transposition is a common type of beginner's error, and it is often corrected for it.

|    |     |                                  |          |
|----|-----|----------------------------------|----------|
| 4. | 224 | sub <sup>3</sup><br>sub.<br>sub. | q 22 1-4 |
|----|-----|----------------------------------|----------|

---

<sup>1</sup> $\mathcal{L}_1$ , 157.

<sup>2</sup>Wart's definition of the colon's function seems applicable here: "that is to make, much number of sentences . . . we have a period sentence: when yet the matter following is a new sense, and plaine declaration of the purpose: as, I am very glad of your prosperitie: for I heard, as you were in trouble: which were apparent alterations: and so of others." Wart, p. 163.

<sup>3</sup>The tail of the cross seems thin and barely joined in my facsimile





Verities in James and Julian (continued)

What was noted last (apart from the removal of the comma) was simply the substitution of "shall" for "shall" . . . but "shall" was wrongly substituted for "shall" two words earlier. . . . The later reading is thus considerably worse than the earlier, which is bad enough. And the fault must apparently be ascribed rather to the compositor who (as in line 41) compounded his original error in the process of putting it right than to the reader who required this error to be corrected.<sup>2</sup>

9. 224vCH[ed]  
Comp. 2

q 61 L.1

you,<sup>2</sup>  
you,  
you

The passage reads in the Quarto:

224v.15 Old Is. This night you shall behold him at our Feast,  
And see the volume of young Parthe's face,  
And find delight, with those with beauties you,  
Hundred many remembrance's histories,  
And you too see an other little content:  
And what stands in this false vision dead,  
Find wisdom in the argument of his eyes.

There are three main divisions in the passage. The main division comes between the fifth line and the last two, but there is also a stronger division between lines 3 and 4 than between any two of the first three lines. It might be considered that lines 4 and 5 are an abbreviation of line 3 or that they are a slightly new line. Either way they go together in a closer way than the first

<sup>2</sup>q, etc.

<sup>3</sup>In the Quarto there is a false read given the verse looking like this: ' . . . like the corner of a quail. Almost the same combination of comma and quail appears five lines below after "lover." However, this undoubtedly did not influence the reader to change the word to a comma; there is no evidence thus far that he recognized any other allowing punctuation.

Tormenta is agradado, indigo (continued)

with the preference of the second with its accent. It is  
the precisely this sort of distribution that kept preserving  
the value.<sup>1</sup>

9. Elle (Sifid)  
Comp. 2

q. Elle 1.2

quoth si/ghiled  
quar/ th a Continence  
quar/ thas Continence

The whole passage reads in the quarto:

Ag. But upon you, what a man are you?  
El. One Continence, that had hath none, himself to use.  
Ag. If my truth it be well said, for himself to use quoth si/  
ghiled of any of you tell us where I say that the  
young house?

The corrected state of the Folio reads:

Ag. If my truth it be said, for himself to, use quar/  
th has Continence, use any of you tell us where I say  
that the young house?

Some remarks:

Two of the three alterations made here are as they should  
be: the pronunciation is properly corrected, and "Continence"  
is rightly once placed . . . but the word "will" omitted  
from the first line was not restored; nor was the punning  
value of this line changed, though the sense after "ye"  
reads thus "use" represents a blunder of the most obvi-  
ous kind.<sup>2</sup>

the reader's choice of what to correct and what to leave alone  
seems very puzzling. Again and again we see identical altera-  
tions with those that were corrected ignored. Also, changed are

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 85, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>The space here is not as great as its support location.

<sup>3</sup>L. 1101.

Pariente is James Earl Miller (continued)

note shows desirability from my point of view can hardly be passed up, not, as Dr. Brown points out, obvious blunders are not corrected. It is almost as though someone were working with the intention of making a parade of proof-reading rather than of doing an honest job. The it possible that the proof-reader in R's case was, sometimes at least, not Jaggerd himself, as Dr. Brown has suggested, but someone like Carpenter is attempting to justify his superior position? The changes from copy have this same character. It would be interesting to check whether the pages which have changes of a less accidental kind are those with fewer changes altogether, as though the proofreader were determined to find something to justify his occupation by inventing the need for correction when he found none. This would be very in accord with the psychological condition of a journeyman employee than with that of the master himself.

10. 224r(14)642  
Comp. II

Q 12 1,30

poore, but  
poor, about  
poore, but

Another transposition typical of the beginner. The frequency of these is some evidence that the proofreader was regarded as having the same right to reproduction as the scribe and was placed up automatically as a letter type.

11. 224r(15)643

Q 12b 1,4

thou,  
thou  
thou,

Variant 1a ~~then, and, then~~ (reversed)

This is interesting. The Quarto has:

condemned willies, I do apprehend thee,  
They and go with me, for thou must die.

The next after "die" is a large diamond-shaped dot, which looks less like a period than a comma for which the compositor evidently mistook it, for the corrected state of the Folio still reads

condemned willies, I do apprehend thee.  
They and go with me, for thou must die,

Now this is the end of the speech, the comma after "die" is much more noticeable than the lack of punctuation after "thee." It seems possible therefore that the reader asked for a period after "die" rather than after "thee," although more likely after both, but that the compositor, perhaps with some recollection of the copy, placed one after "thee" only.

### Summary (cont.)

In those cases where the compositor followed copy, variants 1<sub>1</sub>, 2<sub>1</sub>, and 3<sub>1</sub>, we see the proof-reader changing punctuation in order to eliminate typos, just as we have been able to do in plays and prose manuscripts.

In variants 1<sub>2</sub>, 7<sub>2</sub>, and 8 because of unsatisfactory transcription, it is difficult to ascertain the trend of events, though some possibilities have been mentioned as seeming more probable than others.

1<sub>2</sub> diamond-shaped dot.

1<sub>2a</sub>.

Variants 2 and 10 are restatements of copy text which compositor E had failed to reproduce through mechanical error.

This leaves variants 4, 6, and 11 where it is certain that E changed copy text and reasonably clear what the proof-reader did afterwards.

In variant 4, if we ignore the transposition, E added a comma, which explains syntax. The reader (presumably)<sup>1</sup> let it stand.

In variant 6 the compositor found an anti-synthetic comma which he changed to an even more violently anti-synthetic period. The reader (presumably) removed it and put nothing in its place, leaving the syntax impossible.

In variant 11 E left out a syntactically useful period. The proof-reader (presumably) restored it.

We therefore have the interesting intelligence that in only one of these cases did the reader restore copy-text where there was an obvious need for a period at the end of a sentence. In the other two cases he did not. In the case where the compositor had added a syntactic point he let it stand; in the case where the compositor had merely altered a point which was anti-synthetic, he repeated it. This is further confirmation that he consulted his own judgment rather than copy, and his judgment was even more to be delivered on the side of syntactic preservation.

<sup>1</sup>"Presumably," because we can never be absolutely certain that we are not dealing with that treacherous case where the proof-reader called for a change which the compositor failed to note, unless, of course, we have the proof-sheet itself.



Compositor T, as we have, altered copy punctuation as only about one line in five, little altogether, as compared at least with his colleague Compositor B. But, again, as we have seen in the case of the proof-reader, although he often is moved with a syntactic principle in one case, let us say in variant 6, he never imitated the copy in a non-dictatorial place, for example, in variant 1. In other words we might say that although when he does alter, it is in accord with some syntactic principle, it does not follow that he will invariably alter for the sake of that principle; he may leave things as he found them. Again we have the feeling that the compositor's changing of copy punctuation is as specific as the reader's correction of proof-sheets.

Variant 1 illustrates his tendency (as well as B's) of reluctance to add copy punctuation, variants 3, 4, 7, and 10 the typesetter's errors, transpositions, as well as the nervousness which resulted in misarrangement as well as miswriting. Not even through some of the most partial passages we are aware of B's awareness of the various marks of punctuation and their conventional uses in relation to syntax. At the same time there seems to be a lack of the enthusiasm shown by the proof-reader in expunging non-syntactic punctuation.

### Variant 10, Sheet IV, Part I

Sheet IV, Part I is thought to be printed from the 1833 Quarto, q1, "with slight literary editing,"<sup>1</sup> and Alex Walker conjectures another

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. W. Wieg, The Editorial System in Shakespeare (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1941), p. 112 and elsewhere.

Verbalia in Excer. II, Part I (continued)

poetry as well as composer interference.<sup>1</sup>

The paper also punctuation verbalia.<sup>2</sup>

1. a[10] not by 5 = one variant

2. a[10] not by 5 = one variant

3. a[10] not  
Comp. 8

q<sup>2</sup> 20s 1.30

Prisoners:  
Prisoners:  
Prisoners:<sup>3</sup>

The corrected passage in the Folio reads:

So will (they) have all up Prisoners;  
And then I wyl'd the same once again

Since there is a quad mark before the colon in the uncorrected state, it is possible that the reader asked only for that one correction. On the other hand it is possible that the correction was already thought of as more appropriate before "and," the colon

<sup>1</sup>Allen Walker, Typical Problems of the First Folio (Cambridge at the University Press, 1925), pp. 107-111 and passim.

<sup>2</sup>q, 2102.

<sup>3</sup>I have used the Folger Facsimile, W, 113.

<sup>4</sup>An ending quad mark.

<sup>5</sup>The Yale Facsimile here shows a colon though many other variants listed by Elmes in its corrected state--"worthless" for "worthless" (10), "which" for "which" (10), a proper "u" instead of an overlined one in "and" (10). It is possible, therefore, that the correction in a script is Elmes. The corrected state of this variant might differ from the uncorrected state only in the removal of the quad. However, in my analysis, I am assuming his reading.

Varia in Letter IV, Page 1 (continued)

being perhaps reserved for a protastic-apostolic relationship.<sup>1</sup>

1. 126 (28) 144  
 126p. 1

q. 28 1. 1

Quest. our Grandfather,<sup>1</sup>  
 Quest. your Grandfather,<sup>2</sup>  
 Quest. your Grandfather;

The second state of the Folio reads:

141- Quest. I am not like of Quest. your Grandfather;  
 but yet as Quest. 141.

There would seem to be an intention to change a stem to a stem-  
 cald here, even in B. However, the Quarto, as is shown, has a  
 third dot above the stem, which might have been mistaken for a  
 confusion, which B, for some, simply intended to represent from  
 copy. Since the spelling stem appears in the uncorrected stem,  
 the proof-reader, intent upon righting the typographical errors,  
 the "e" instead of "v" in "Quest" as well as the inverted type,  
 found the confusion well enough. Notice that here, where, B  
 being complete, we must presume neither that B as proof-reader,  
 only suggest corrections were made in the line.

#### Remarks General

It is these two variants seem to be following copy, either as it  
 was or as he thought it to be (unless we are mistaken about variant B,  
 and give us an opportunity to study the variations of his high percentage  
 of variation. However, it will be noted that both places already have

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 12, n. 1, for B on the colon.

<sup>2</sup>A third dot above the stem.

<sup>3</sup>As spelling stem.

heavy punctuation as, as in variant 2, are thought to have.

The printed-texter who knew the facts and almost towards greater systematic clarity as well as all.

Professor's Note to the Analysis of Manuscript Variants in  
Becket and Curial, from Andrew, Becket, Curial,  
and the Book

Just as Dr. Hume found himself discovering things of the utmost importance not directly related to his examination of proof-reading situations, so it had been in a small way in this study. Things went both backwardly and forwardly.

For example, when Dr. Hume took as his working hypothesis a certain order of printing and binding, held by scholars till that time to be true of the Folio, in order to begin his investigations, he had no more investigated a little till then he found that it was not true.

So, in one case, we have had to take as working hypothesis "dog's and others" conclusions about the origin of Folio texts. But even the little we have learned about the composers' habits, in the study of Becket and Curial copy, for example, went about us in things that were very. And with numbers of uncharacteristic changes from copy of the kind that must be postulated if we accept the hypothesis of quarto copy in some of the plays the subject.

We would therefore do well to stand ready in the matter of coming to conclusions about our own affairs and do better to examine various possibilities in the case of the hypothetical assignment between quarto text

and unknown manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> If our own researches in the matter of copy-pasting practices can shed some light on this very vexed question, it will not only be worth a small digression here, but will in the end provide a sounder basis for our own study than a rigidly correct acceptance of authority.

We, therefore, must speculate about copy itself before committing ourselves to any conclusion about the treatment of that copy, and that is part of the work that we undertake in the consideration of the next group of plays, at a greater length than has been necessary thus far.

### Trinities and Comedies

Trinities and Comedies is thought to have been printed from a corrected copy of the Quarto of 1609.<sup>2</sup>

There are two pages showing penetration marks:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Just as the consistent dissimilarity in the treatment of Quarto copy between F's and P's pages enabled us to conclude that there was no collator between Quarto and Folio, so now, by other words, we trace the changes by hand upon the printed page of the Quarto. It may be that we shall ultimately find that a person who wrote in Folio that he found in a manuscript upon the Quarto page or made alterations on that page because of what he found in a manuscript will prove equally dissimilar.

It may be that we shall find this whole notion of a hypothetical physical design untenable, and shall discover that the compositor worked with both before him directly from one or the other in some yet to be determined manner. At any rate, the notion of the intervening editor is a very far-reaching one with which we now have of the compositor's behavior, which was in itself editorial.

<sup>2</sup>WILLIAM WILLIAMS, "Shakespeare's Trinities and Comedies: Relationship of Quarto and Folio" ON SHAKESPEARE'S PUBLISHING, III, 1938-1951, Charlottesville, Va., 193-243.

<sup>3</sup>I, etc.

VARIOUS IN TRICKS AND CHARMS

1. 4th Sp. 391 Yale Facsimile<sup>1</sup> and by American variants

2. 3rd Sp. 391 Yale Facsimile, Folio "p. 39"<sup>2</sup> and by B--one  
variant,

3. 4th Yale Facs. p. 390, at  
Comp. 4

q<sup>3</sup> the 1.13

his,  
his,  
his<sup>3</sup>

The line in the quarto reads:

      Heere comes Interlude. Engl. He jabbling with him.

The period after "his," as well, however, as the one after  
Interlude, is printed very low and might have been mistaken  
for a comma. Also, there is another "his" a few lines above  
which does not a line with a comma with which the compositor  
may have confused the second "his."

It reads:

      (1.4) Time. jabbling hath brought his heels from him,  
      Engl. He Interlude<sup>3</sup> Time. He.

This is the sort of passage for which Flatter<sup>3</sup> might argue that  
the comma between telescoped ones, that is, that Inter inter-  
rupts Time and again simultaneously with him. Since it is  
not known whether the Quarto punctuation represents material as

<sup>1</sup>It should be remembered that Tricks and Charms is arranged one  
copy for leaf 1, under "39" and under "39" but that Interlude which falls  
from between the continuous pagination of the tragedy with p. 1. The  
line p. 39 and 40 are, therefore, the last page of Tricks and Charms and  
the first page of Interlude respectively.

<sup>2</sup>Yale Facsimile, 72, 260b.

<sup>3</sup>Flatter, Interlude. See above pp. 14-17.

Variants in Twelfth and Thirteenth (continued)

phonetic pronunciation of *no*. Either *no* (d) be then to treat the *no* in line 4 thus. However, the *no* in the variant place can almost certainly not bear this interpretation, since it is presumably the composer's *no* and therefore, with an symphonic or typographical advantage conceivable over the copy pronunciation, presumably placed there in error.

The question mark of the reader is an admirable correction. If the meaning is supposed to be "Is there an *ad libitum* with him?" Without the question mark the interpretive nature of the symbol is not immediately apparent (this kind of euphemism being the great justification, no doubt, for systematic punctuation in general). As a matter of fact, the passage might be an indication of surprise, "Is *ad libitum* with him?" and we do not forget the point made several times already that the period might have been an archaical distinction on behalf of *no*, to indicate falling instead of rising inflection.

2.

*no*

§ 41 L.14

*no*!  
*no*,  
*no*!

The Quoth passage reads:

*Quoth.* What is he says than another.  
*Quoth.* He says than what he thinks he is.  
*Quoth.* Is he so much: does you not think he thinks like  
wells a better man than I am?

The corrected state of the Folio reads:





prize and indignation.

Again the reader changes to question mark after the rhetorical question. With the possible exception of the comma after "thunder," the Folio punctuation seems inferior to that of the Quarto *both* almost any point of view. The comma after "thunder" I guess to be in accord with some notion that there ought to be a mark of punctuation before a direct report of what was said. The occurrence in such a situation is fairly frequent.

The changes in the last three variants almost suggest that the Quarto was not here the copy for the Folio. The fact that "the" (in the second variant) is spelled as in the Quarto is here not helpful as evidence, inasmuch as it is *d*'s customary spelling. Gray says:

It is, of course, clear that the copy of Q from which F was printed must have been minutely altered by comparison with a manuscript, which incidentally supplied the prologue, and it is in the relation of this manuscript to the one from which Q was itself printed that is the main textual problem of the play.<sup>1</sup>

Could it be, after all, that "lost papers which turned up among the playhouse manuscripts" which Gray conjectures,<sup>2</sup> are responsible for a more cautious frame of mind towards changing copy in both composition and reading?

A reader who made as useful a change to question mark in the first

<sup>1</sup>Gray, *First Folio*, p. 363.

<sup>2</sup>Gray, p. 367.

Verbs in Twining and Grassy (continued)

two variants, that in line 41 and that in line 43, and even more nicely in the last, line 44, could easily have improved to something like the Quare punctuation. Was he Unlustrive or restrined? Lack of attention would have missed the chance for change in the last variant.

Furthermore, if the punctuation of the first state of the Folio is here possibly authentic, we must grant that it is based on other considerations than syntactic clarity. Now, in commenting on Folio Alexander's sharing the punctuation of the Quare state-system, observe: "the punctuation of the single directions does not follow consistently: e.g. III, 41, 1 'Water, Rodericus Twynne, was' where 2 has 'Water Rodericus and Twynne was'.<sup>1</sup>

1. The (Folios "18," Title Page, p. 171)400 Q at 1.43  
Comp. 2

Water Twynne<sup>2</sup>  
Water Rodericus  
Water Twynne

The two dots of the double colon may have suggested an unprinted "u," or other copy was used, or the compositor was lustrative. The reader is unwilling to a priori.

<sup>1</sup>Comp. First Folio, p. 501, n. 10.

<sup>2</sup>no under colon.

Varia in Trilium and Scandale (continued)

Summary Comments

*I*'s changes from copy are puzzling in the extreme. Either he was very careless or he had other copy, for each of which contemporary suggestions have been offered in the proper place. *I*'s alterations are obviously an error.

About the reader, there is nothing new to report. He continues to make changes in the interest of clarity of system and uniformity of notation.

Varia in Time Indefinites

Time Indefinites is thought to have been printed from the 1615 Quarto, Q1,<sup>1</sup> which was printed from Q2 (1400), which, in turn, was printed from a defective copy of Q1 (1384), but across III, 2 was added, for which there must have been a manuscript, though there is little to suggest that the addition formed part of a manuscript of the complete play.

The following pages contain punctuation variants.<sup>2</sup>

1. *note*(XI) not by *I*, five variants
2. *not*(XII) not by *I*, three variants
3. *note*(XIV) not by *I*, one variant
4. *del*(XV) not by *I*, two variants
5. *del*(XVI) not by *I*, three variants
6. *del*(XVII) not by *I*, one variant

---

<sup>1</sup>Time Indefinites Ordered for Edward Blount, London, 1611.

<sup>2</sup>*q.v.* 221r.

Parlante in Three Anonymous (continued)

1. with(12)and q<sup>1</sup> at 1.18  
 Comp. B

Away with him  
 Away with that <sup>B</sup>  
 Away with him,

The passage in the corrected state of the Folio reads:

agg. Away with him, and make a fire straight,

It is likely that the error after "him" in the uncorrected state of the Folio was nothing but an taking quad and that the corrector would not have thought to add the comma had his attention not been caught by the typographical fault. On the other hand, B might have been solely responsible.

2. bi q at 1.21

and we survive,  
 unless survive,  
 unless survive,

The Quarto reads:

Alonzo goes to rest, and we survive,  
 To trouble under fifteen threatening looks.

The Folio corrected reads:

Alonzo goes to rest, unless survive,  
 To trouble under living threatening looks.

It is only the Folio compositor who has here used the kind of period which might be thought to be gynaele, that is, as though to indicate that that comes after is an afterthought though it is woven into the preceding syntax. For this he would presumably

<sup>1</sup>Volger description, ff. 101i.

<sup>2</sup>Equation not correct.

Varia in His. Johnson (continued)

have had to have other copy than the Quarto, plausible manuscript, in other words. The evidence in favor of other copy is "looked" for the "looked" of the Quarto. The evidence against it is that the spelling is identical and the change to "looked" might easily be accounted for on the grounds of either scribalism or intended correction. The possibility that I substituted the period for the comma out of his own dramatic imagination is slight.

The next question may be asked here as in the previous variant, whether the only correction the reader intended may not have been the typographical one of inserting a space between the "and" and "me," and that I misunderstood or for some other reason miscorrected.

1. not not<sup>1</sup>

q. Adv. 1.24

stems.  
stems.  
stems.

The Quarto reads:

- 1.15 In peace and better rest you have my arms,  
Hence radiant Champions, rest you here in rest,  
Hence live well: thence and thence;  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live.

The corrected stage of the Folio reads:

In peace and better rest you have my arms,  
Hence radiant Champions, rest you here in rest,  
Hence live well: thence and thence;  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live,  
Hence live as I live, here as I live.

---

<sup>1</sup> If one does not count lines of space, as Dr. Hume evidently did, but only lines of text, this would be the 17th.

Varia in *Illegible* (continued)

In *Illegible*, but without and without change,  
In *Illegible* and *Illegible* you have of *Illegible*.

Except for the correction of the double "g" to "prologue" and the capitalization of "Illegible," "Illegible," "Illegible," and "Illegible" ("Illegible" was already capitalized) there is no change from copy either in spelling or in punctuation—except the possible suggestion to omit "and" from line 11 for metrical reasons, is irrelevant, albeit such a suggestion is not doubtful.

It seems almost certain that the error is a simple error, perhaps picked up by E from the first "Illegible," i. 11 of Q, i. 11 to P.

|    |     |                         |           |
|----|-----|-------------------------|-----------|
| 4. | 111 |                         | Q 11 1-11 |
|    |     | and . . . Illegible and |           |
|    |     | and . . . Illegible and |           |
|    |     | and . . . Illegible and |           |

The line is the exact state of the Folio reader

and *Illegible* was changed to *Illegible* and.

In *Illegible* <sup>1</sup>

Almost certainly . . . the "u" was added mainly for the sake of rhyming up the line after the advertisement by the preceding "Illegible" had been removed, and hence on my preliminary conclusion that *Illegible* contains only one real *Illegible*, though it certainly contains one *Illegible*.

By no means, however, there is only one variant line in *Illegible* dealing only with punctuation. That the byline is advertisement there can be no doubt. There is therefore no doubt that the

---

<sup>1</sup>Q, 111.

Verities in Titus Andronicus (continued)

correction is purely typographical and need not detain us further.

8. 144 Q. 81. 1.23

his, that . . . Foolness  
his, that . . . Foolness?  
his that . . . Foolnesses

The passage reads in the Quarto:

Alar. A better head for glorious body fits,  
Than his, that shakes for age and Foolness.

The corrected Folio reading seems to change the sense somewhat:

Alar. A better head for glorious body fits,  
Than his that shakes for age and Foolnesses.

The Quarto punctuation by syntactic standards consistently reads "Than his, the one you've just mentioned, who shakes etc." The Folio punctuation seems to imply "Than anyone who shakes for age etc."

There is certainly no justification for the change from a non-restrictive to a restrictive duplication. It is either gratuitous on the part of the corrector or a misconstruction by the compositor who had been asked only to correct the spelling of "Foolnesses." Perhaps the extra length of the line produced by the change suggested the compensatory deletion.

9. 145(13)227 Q. 81v. 1.24

Comp.2

Friend,  
Friend,<sup>13</sup>  
Friend<sup>13</sup>

---

The Mr. Elton prints out, the Folio facsimile shows only the dot of the question mark here.





Translating the Winnipeg (continued)

W, 101

Q 80 1.10

waiter I . . . hands.  
wait'er I . . . hands.  
wait'er, I . . . hand? 1

The fourth passage reads:

Full well independent  
Agree these hands, with that great bragg of mine,  
That waiter I beg'd the Supper at thy hands.

And the corrected Folio reads:

Full well independent  
Agree these hands, with that great bragg of mine,  
That wait'er, I beg'd the Supper at thy hands.<sup>1</sup>

In the corrected state the character of everything which follows the "e" of "hand" is in doubt. In Dr. Stearns's book only the lower script of an "e" very faintly shows. In the Tria four stichs, which has the corrected state, the upper script shows as well, and both the upper and the lower edges of the quad are shown to have taken toll.

My analysis would be that the only correction intended and made was the moving of the comma after I, which was probably placed there at one as a transposing error, like as many of the errors, and that both he and the proof-reader started the error after "waiter," in accord with the frequent practice of placing a mark of punctuation before a corrected speech.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Supposed to be a faintly taken "e" followed by a quad mark.

<sup>2</sup>I takes the liberty of pointing the "e" of "hands"; see above for explanation.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 101.

Variants to King Lear (continued)

The other variation from copy, not, of course, one of the known variants, is minutely the result of that convention still practiced today which places an apostrophe wherever a letter that might be inserted is omitted.

There is, however, still another point, and that is that neither the composer nor the proofreader saw fit to make a verbal change. Surely "that good hoggis of thine" is not the second person. If it had been, the "widdes" even after "that" would not be represented, but it is not satisfactory here. A change to "wid" might have been attempted. A change of "That" to "Thee" would have been utterly hepting. However these changes were not made and from the treatment of this passage we might conclude that purely verbal changes were eschewed.

The changes that were made, all of a trivial kind, seem to be dictated by the conviction that their retention would have been "wrong," almost as we regard derelict spelling as wrong. Certain words were unnecessarily capitalised, a couple of apostrophes were unnecessarily added, and a comma was placed before the report of what someone said. It is interesting to note that we now have cases of its use before both direct and indirect quotation.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 101.



Veronica in Times Intelligence (continued)

separate the vocative from the object of the following clause,  
and he removed the period from after "agony" which had  
separated part of the clause from the adverbial phrase which  
pertains to the verb; he also substituted a colon for the  
comma after "agony" and omitted the comma after "harshness."  
The first two punctuation changes are of the usual kind, in the  
direction of modernizing systems; the last two are very strange.

Dr. Himes, examining upon the difference between the corrected  
form, the colon after "agony," and the comma, observes:

The uncorrected reading . . . is perfectly acceptable. A  
colon is certainly not needed after "agony," but one is  
needed at the end of the next line in place of the in-  
correct period "."" of "harshness". Now again, there-  
fore, no harm observation. Possibly the reader did  
not note what he noted sufficiently clearly; or my note  
his efforts resulted in one corruption.<sup>1</sup>

This suggestion would absolve the reader from having entered  
the colon after "agony," but it would then leave him in the equally  
culpable position of having truncated one of exactly the same  
system-hating kind, after "agony."

A weak case might be made out for this passage being a place,  
like one previously discussed,<sup>2</sup> in which the Quaker punctuation  
attempts to indicate that the letter is being read a certain way,

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Himes.

<sup>2</sup>In Philadelphia's Times, one shows pp. 14-15.



Variants in Simon's (continued)

II. 4843-4844.  
Comp. II

(Looking in Quarta)

company  
company.

The passage ends a speech.

Jo. I see then not not do up company. yet then give,  
Boy. Also (or lord) I have but bid a file.

If I understood Mr. Simon's printing chronology correctly, and the history of apparatus I's contributions, this is the first page of the Folio I set. It is possible that if the Folio was the first book I had worked on that this was the first page of types he had ever set in his life.<sup>1</sup> It is curious, therefore, that it is the very one which he most have set from manuscript, since it is from Act III, scene 2 which he started in the Quarta, and we have elsewhere no chance to observe how he handled his copy for the first time. We would, of course, expect typical beginners' errors like the mechanical ones of transposition or inversion, but it would be instructive to start from the very beginning to learn whether he gave up or has failed to copy as then was on, a process we can watch in any case.

The only question to consider here, then, is the nature of the proof-reader's change. Any other punctuation than the period would be irregular, though it is another of those occasions when we cannot rule out the possibility of the formation of significant

---

<sup>1</sup>II, 515.

Trinitas in *Illeg. Appendix* (continued)

intended speech.<sup>1</sup> That a colon would have been used for such a purpose, however, seems unlikely. A comma or no punctuation at all would seem more appropriate. That even I doubt in his copy, he does not seem to have been bold enough to register to a complete period. Unless, of course, the colon represents nothing but mechanical error. Without copy to me fully speculate.

|     |                    |                               |
|-----|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| 13. | all                | Quintus lacks this<br>passage |
|     | There's<br>There's |                               |

The reader has here witnessed a mechanical error.

|     |                                                        |             |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 14. | all                                                    | Q. 70v 1,26 |
|     | but friends<br>but <sup>2</sup> friend.<br>but friends |             |

The Yale facsimile, which shows the uncorrected state, reads:

15. *Non solum enim glia, sed haec non solum  
friend.* That Quintus loved it was doubt in the dust?

Here there are three changes. The inverted "u" has been righted, an "y" has been added, and a period has been removed. For now we must disagree with Dr. Nixon's analysis that this necessarily represents a transcription. If only a minor one. A full stop is needed after "Trinitas," but there was not room in the line for both the "y" and the period.

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>Apparent p.

Testimonies in *Illeg. Investigations* (continued)

Since the period was sacrificed--though possibly any other composition than I could have managed to get in the "e" without covering the period.<sup>1</sup>

Though we cannot dispute with Mr. Brown on the point about the length of the line, it is probably only his loading of the unfortunate E which has momentarily blinded him to the true state of affairs, and led him to the hasty decision that a full stop is needed after "friends." Actually the Quarta printing is also loading and might have mislead E, for it separates the two lines of the sentence.

The passage in the Quarta reads:

(p. 79, l. 38) *Ita.* Five signs great girls for hours are none  
but friends.<sup>2</sup>  
That Emma Levi is one devil de the devil!

The word here is almost certainly not interrogative but imperative. Were the second line formed as a separate question, the word order would be different. Syntactic punctuation would look somewhat like this:

Five signs great girls--for hours are none  
but friends--that Emma Levi is one devil de the  
devil.

The question mark after "devil" in the Quarta may stand for an exclamation mark, but the period after "friends" has no syntactic function whatever. If the proof-reader were aware of this, he

<sup>1</sup>E. 79.

<sup>2</sup>This dot may or may not be significant. If so so, it might be the top dot of an initial *em*.



variants in John Anderson's (continued)

would probably call for the expunging of the period. It is possible, however, that the proof-reader also overlooked the syntactic connection between the two lines, and that every-thing happened as Dr. Hume's describes. If the Folio proof-reader was conscious of the syntax of the sentence, and was punctuating syntactically, we must then conclude that his leaving the question mark intact was indicative of his allowing it to stand for an exclamation mark.

15. 442b 144/145  
Comp. 8

haniel,  
haniel?  
haniel.

Q. 144 1.4

An inverted period which the compositor straightened.

James Forrest

Contrary to our opinion in the case of James and Philip, we know that I was here allowed to set manuscript copy, for the passages containing variants 12 and 13 are identical in the Quarto. On the other hand, since this play contains some of his earliest work, it might have been partly because of his errors here that he was thenceforth not trusted with manuscript. It is hard to see, therefore, why on the basis of his performance here he should have been trusted to set printed copy any more than manuscript copy. It should be pointed out however that his errors are more likely mechanical ones which betoken an inaptitude in writing, rather than a lack of comprehension in reading.

In general, he here runs true to form, keeping copy punctuation in

variants 1, 3, 4, 18, 19, 16, and 13, and seemingly intending to keep it in 3, 4, and 3.

In variant 3 he replaced a such unnecessary from a syntactic point of view by the downright unnecessary. In variant 7 his error was one of redundancy. In variant 8 he probably intended to add a new notional clause where the reader later placed it but transposed it to another place.

The reader material copy justification in variant 9, where I had had an anti-syntactic full stop, in variant 3 shows a period was needed at the end of a speech, in variants 4, 5, 16, and 13 where the error was distinctly typographical, in variant 7 there a normalizing period is wanted; in other words, he changed for his own reasons and not because he had some mixed copy.

There he changed to something other than copy, as in variants 1 and 2, he did as he acted with conventional syntactic principle. In variants 3, 4, 18, 16, and perhaps others, there is evidence of possible miscommunication, so that it would be risky to attempt to analyze further than we have already done in the particular place or in general at all.

### Ending

Ending is now generally thought to have been set from an annotated quote of 1908, Q1, the good quote, though there are many puzzling questions left unanswered by this assumption, for example, why the Folio ends just 190 lines down in Q1. The possibility that I am printed from the prompt-book is also still considered, although, as Greg says, "the

Varia in Engel (continued)

evidence in its favor is not always clear.<sup>1</sup> We can do no other than accept the view of Weg and of Allen rather than ours:

To have in Q1 the subscription list, printed from Engel papers, and with the aid of the Folio the errors are easily corrected. That the Folio will not serve as is an independent witness to the correctness of readings where the two texts agree.<sup>2</sup>

Engel shows six punctuation variants on four pages.<sup>3</sup>

1. 886c[247] set by C (or possibly A)<sup>4</sup>—one variant
2. 886c[248] set by B—one variant
3. 90c[227] set by B—one variant
4. 90b[176] set by B—three variants

1. 886c[247] 241  
Comp. C (or A)

q 78 1. 88, 25<sup>2</sup>

Age / 2411 . . . like a God the  
Age / 2417 . . . like a God the  
Age / 2417 . . . like a God the

This is part of that passage about which disputes have arisen about whether the scribe(s) precede or follow the composer.

The whole passage is given thus in the Quintus:

<sup>1</sup>See, First Folio, p. 314.

<sup>2</sup>Weg, Textual Problems, p. 117.

<sup>3</sup>q, 201.

<sup>4</sup>There is a slight discrepancy here. Ordinarily when Dr. Allen wishes to indicate that he is withdrawing a page to C, not that it is not C's is the C's, he writes C with an asterisk, thus, C\*. On I, 386, however, in talking of Quine he he says "Three pages of this quire were pre-composed; the single page 241 [set by Composer A] . . ." & Allen leaves in the page in describing p. 241 he says "241 (Quine) . . . Probably set by Composer C." One can understand the result of several readings, but which is uncertain.

<sup>5</sup>The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, Shakespeare's Quartos, The First Folio, 1963. Transcribed in Library from the copy in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California, 1917.

Verdicts in Quarto (continued)

- 1.23 What piece of work is a/ man, how noble in reason,  
how infinite in faculties, in form and moving like  
expressed and admirable in action, how like an angel,  
pale in apprehension, how like a God! the beauty  
of the world; the/ passages of death; and yet to  
die, . . .

(The first Quarto, sometimes helpful in establishing a choice of  
emphasis previously because it so often gives nearly the plot of  
a speech, is here hopelessly corrupt.)<sup>1</sup>

The meaning that the Quarto punctuation seems at first to make  
spring most easily to mind might be paraphrased thus: "What (a)  
piece of work is a soul how noble in reason how infinite in  
faculties?"

But then no ambiguity arises. Should we read "How infinite in  
faculties, in form, and moving," or "How infinite in faculties  
in form and moving how expressed and admirable?" If the latter,  
then what follow would read "In reason how like an angel! In  
apprehension how like a God!" If the former, "How expressed and  
admirable in action! How like an angel in apprehension! How  
like a God! The beauty of the world! The passages of death!"

Let us see how the Folio compositor (or compositor and editor)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Q1 170 L.17 Now, The faith, this great world you are creatures  
on earth, / Be not the spangled harvest, nor march, nor march, / Be not the  
that is as glorious a creature, / Creatures not so, . . . (Complete First  
Quarto, 1611.) Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, no. 7, Oxford, At the  
Clarendon Press, n.d.)

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 95, n. 1.

### Variant in English (continued)

possibly. The uncorrected stage reads:

What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason!  
how infinite in faculty! in forms and moving how new,  
perfect and consummation! In action, how like an angel!  
in apprehension, how like a god! the beauty of the world,  
the tenor of his day, and yet in us, . . .

We cannot altogether ignore the fact that there is a true earlier action with after "man." Why then, the switch to the infinitive question mark? Are we to assume that the compositor had only one in his case? The true infinitive mark was not a novelty; it is referred to and exhibited in Bart's manuscript<sup>1</sup> (MSB), as well as in the 1599 printed version of his work.

Although it is not very likely, we ought to consider the possibility whether some, at least, of the question marks might not be interrogative, in a new and gross interpretation originating in Jaggard's shop. "What is he like an angel? In apprehension. How like a god? by having the beauty of the world etc." Except very small hardly be guilty of such an error, but there is an outside chance that a stupid printer might have corrected all sentences beginning with the reading interrogative "how?" as well as a question mark. The scribe C of A Jaggard such a printer as such as look for the unfortunate editor that has been sought for the Folio Shakespeare? We shall we say that complaint is back and

---

<sup>1</sup> Bart, p. 130. It is true that there is a slight left hand on the "center" in the photographic facsimile which Shakespeare prints of the manuscript page, though he gives the correct form in his printed copy-text.

Testimony in English (Continued)

realize that the question marks are all exclamation marks!

2. 002102100  
Comp. 2

Q Sir L-1

return, people  
return, people  
return, people

The passage in Q begins in 02, 1.31:

the small female bears,  
To grant and must value a waste life,  
Not that the deed of something after death,  
The politician's remedy, from which some  
Q Sir L-1 the traitor returns, reveals the still,  
And when we rather have them life as best,

Dr. Hume comments:

Observe that although a case was anticipated for a  
full stop after "return" (and rightly so), the initial  
letter of the following word serves as appropriate  
letter-that, in short, an altogether complete correc-  
tion was not achieved.<sup>2</sup>

3. 00511771000,11  
Comp. 2

Q Sir L-11, 12

now now/ arrangements; we  
how a'ye 00-/ Hume we  
how a'ye 00-/ Hume we

The passage in Q reads:

. . . this might be the case of a politician, which  
the now now/ arrangements; we that would circumvent  
we, might it not? . . .

The corrected state of the voice reads:

. . . It  
might be the case of a politician which the how  
a'ye 00-/ Hume we that would circumvent we,  
might it not?

<sup>2</sup>1. 302. But see Ross, op. cit., p. 31, n. 1.

Variant in Index (continued)

This is "is" for "this," "v're efficient" for "are-reading," and "could" for "would," as well as the relation of "and"—mostly inferior readings, yet some deceptive; "v're-efficient" with respect to politicians is, in fact, good. Has there another copy? Dr. Henson seems to think not. He comments:

That the Folio proof-reader did not consult the copy (dated 9/1 1894-5) when correcting this page, but that he might be here done so, as may be very sure, has the variant . . . which shows an intelligent correction of the punctuation in lines 11-12 but which shows no other change.<sup>1</sup>

4. pyr-(iff)ald?  
Comp. 1

ald, his  
ald, in  
ald, his

Q 12v L.4

One of P's mechanical errors:

5. ald

laugh at that? Further  
laugh<sup>2</sup> at that? pyr<sup>2</sup>  
laugh at that? pyr-

Q 12v L.13, 17

The Quarto passage reads:

You got you? to my ladies tellin, I tell her, let her  
point us each thins, in this fir? may she want  
now, who has laugh at that? Further laugh tell  
us one thing.

The correction here has made two essential typographical changes—  
he asked for a hyphen for the text on word at the end of the line  
and that the linking space and be pushed down. He did not restore

<sup>1</sup>L<sub>2</sub> 301.

<sup>2</sup>L<sub>2</sub> 302 303

<sup>3</sup>Dr. Henson, etc., of course, gives only the two states of the Folio, prints the variant thus: "laugh at . . . pyr? laugh at . . . pyr<sup>2</sup>". But we are interested in the "that?" as well, which he overlooks in the Folio.

Varia in English (continued)

the period of the copy, over which the editor seems to have no advantage. Both spontaneously and conventionally the period would seem to meet the case.

1.            all                      all thing  
                                          swelling  
                                          one thing

The third case of purely mechanical error being corrected on this page. And if we glance at the eighteen variants shown by Dr. Mann in English as a whole, the three that have to do with punctuation and the fifteen others that Dr. Mann lists, we realize that they are all of this kind. The reader was certainly not interested in fidelity to copy, but in general good sense. Even his last change, which is a swelling change from "venustile" to "amabile" of which Dr. Mann says is to "a more sophisticated arbitrary" introduced by the Trille reader,<sup>1</sup> is of this sort. There is not a single substantive change in the punctuation or anything else on the page. It reproduces Dr. Mann's list:<sup>2</sup>

- |                |                           |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| 1. <u>all</u>  | <u>all, in</u>            |
| 2. <u>all</u>  | <u>fit, his</u>           |
|                | <u>twentytwo</u>          |
| 3-4 <u>all</u> | <u>twenty point</u>       |
|                | <u>laughter . . . cry</u> |
|                | <u>laugh at . . . cry</u> |
| 5. <u>all</u>  | <u>swelling</u>           |
|                | <u>one thing</u>          |
| 6. <u>all</u>  | <u>swelling</u>           |
|                | <u>swelling</u>           |

<sup>1</sup> Trille, 200.

<sup>2</sup> Trille, 200.



Variant 1a ending (continued)

|         |                    |
|---------|--------------------|
| 7. 41   | rights             |
|         | times              |
| 8. 41   | For do             |
|         | From do            |
| 9-10430 | Righted . . . Said |
|         | Righted . . . Said |

(The essential change was evidently the addition of the "d" to "right," but since the "d" on "said" is expendable, the compositor was able by leaving this "d" off to leave the line-length unchanged.)

|         |                  |
|---------|------------------|
| 11. 431 | <del>fact</del>  |
|         | <del>fact</del>  |
| 12. 437 | to the           |
|         | to the           |
| 13. 443 | Exhausted? shape |
|         | Exhausted? shape |
| 14. 451 | violate          |
|         | violate          |
| 15. 453 | a number         |
|         | number           |
| 16. 463 | <del>do</del>    |
|         | <del>do</del>    |
| 17. 463 | Foremost         |
|         | Foremost         |
| 18. 466 | Conciliate       |
|         | Conciliate       |

It is interesting that presumably there is here not a single case of misconstruction.

Variant 1b/2

There is not much more to be said in a general way than has already been indicated in the comments on the individual variants.

Variants 4, 5, and 6 show mechanical errors by E corrected by the proof-reader.

Variant 7 shows misconstruction, and of variant 8 we can hardly demonstrate whether either the compositor or the proof-reader is emphasizing syntax, or how, without knowing what they thought the syntax was.

### Verdicts in Reading (continued)

Parad 3 shows an uncharacteristic coupling of copy punctuation by E, and a characteristic insertion of a wrong syntactic division by the proof-reader.

On the whole, Reading is a disappointing find.

### Wells

The prevailing opinion about the copy for Wells is that it is a hand-corrected copy of the MS! Quoting this, as in the case of Reading, represents a recent reversal of the opinion that copy for the Wells was an independent manuscript. Greg, unduly influenced by Allen Walker,<sup>1</sup> revised his opinion between the 1st edition (1906) of The Autograph Edition of Shakespeare<sup>2</sup> and The First Folio (1908).<sup>3</sup>

There are five pages showing some punctuation variants.<sup>4</sup>

1. actv(III) set by E one variant
2. vrb(XXX) set by E three variants
3. vrb(XXI) set by E two variants
4. vrb(XII) set by E two variants
5. vrb(IXI) set by E one variant

<sup>1</sup>"The Wells text was printed from a copy of the quarto which had been corrected by collation with a more authoritative manuscript," Allen Walker, First Folio of the First Folio (Cambridge, 1913), p. 129.

<sup>2</sup>"Taken from manuscript, possibly the same final papers as the good Quartos listed up." Even, Autograph Edition, p. 129.

<sup>3</sup>"A copy of Q must have been independently corrected by comparison with a manuscript before T was printed from it." Greg, First Folio, p. 263.

<sup>4</sup>1, XII.

Variants in Chivalry (continued)

1. advrQINQall  
Comp. 2

q. 80v 1.50<sup>1</sup>

advrQINQ, Com  
advrQINQ, Com  
advrQINQ? Com

The passage in the quarto reader:

Edg. You indurp, Com air, I an for you.

Dr. Elmes with characteristic vigor calls this "such an absurd garble as only Cooper's E was likely to produce."<sup>2</sup> E, with characteristic fidelity to copy, keeps the same and altered the capital "Q" to a lower case "q". This is a slighter change than altering the same to a full stop and keeping the capital letter. The reader, evidently with an acute knowledge of copy than usual, altered the same to question mark, whether with the intention of the exclamatory same or intent, of course, being and E made the mechanical errors in the correction.

2. vrlvQINQall  
Comp. 2

q. 81 1.24

vrlv, Com  
vrlv, Com  
vrlv, Com

The passage in the quarto reader:

Edg. As you'll com to expect to sight, you  
say, as you will not, com when you are  
well prepared for.

<sup>1</sup>The Treatise of Chivalry, the Spence of Trueth (Edited by E. G. for Thomas Warton, London, 1777), Folger Facsimile 75 1472.

<sup>2</sup>1, 114.

Testimonies to *Spelling* (continued)

The unnumbered signs in the Folio reader

Mag. If you're come to supper to night you  
say, If you will not come when you are  
sent proper<sup>d</sup> time.

It is not within F to make the change from "us" to "it," so  
the very first page of James and Jelling (C.4) he changes "us(x)  
we be in danger" to "If we be in danger." He also changes punctu-  
ation recklessly in his two James and Jelling pages. On the  
other hand, we cannot tell out where very much there are lines  
in this page starting from the Quarto. Everything in Page's speech  
between Q XI and Q XII was there omitted. Presumably the com-  
positor of Q XI had no more room, and the Q XII compositor had  
already set his page by the method of making off. Or else,  
Page's speech was overlooked between Whalley's "Was that mine?"  
and "I would have his mine yeard a killing!" Whatever the  
explanation of the omission in Quarto, the restored speech in F  
is obviously good text and runs free elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> Since the com-  
positor had this source before him, whatever it was, it might also  
be the source of his version of the variant.

Probably the compositor got his version of the variant (the varia-  
nt of the above) from the same source as the restored speech  
runs free.

---

<sup>1</sup>See variant 3.



Parables in Q (continued)

3. Mt 13:12-17  
Comp. 8

Q 13 1-12

heaven,  
heaven,  
heaven!

The Q version passage reads:

[8]. I don't say level, he says she is heaven,  
Say down or speak of things: if you think others,  
Heaven your thoughts, it says about your heaven,  
If any speak to you this is your head,  
Let heaven repeat it with the heavenly voice,  
For if she is not heaven, clouds, and trees,  
There's no one happy, the power of her law  
Is down to heaven.

The Teller's version has divided the passage with full stops. The  
corrected text reads:

[8]. I don't say level to say, she is heaven;  
Say down or speak of things: if you think others,  
Heaven your thoughts. It says about your heaven;  
If any speak have put this in your head,  
Let heaven repeat it with the heavenly voice,  
For if she is not heaven, clouds, and trees,  
There's no one happy. The power of their Word  
Is down to heaven.

It will be noted that along with the changes in punctuation

there is a verbal change, "their Word" for "her law." The use  
of other copy is thereby suggested and not to be ruled out.

"their Word" seems a superior reading. It is, therefore,

<sup>1</sup>in its own right.

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted in what all this shows that the differences  
between the uncorrected and the corrected copies of a passage are only  
those differences indicated by the cited variants. In this case,  
the only difference in the following passage between the corrected and  
the uncorrected texts is the verbal change made by the proferent from  
the above after "heaven" in the italicized text after "heaven."

Veronica in Shakespeare (continued)

possible that the changes in punctuation, the divisions into sentences, are not inventions of Copinger's but a collation revision of the Quarto punctuation, but attributable to a playhouse scribe whose manuscript rather than the Quarto was being used as copy. On the other hand, it is not suitable for following any punctuation faithfully, but rather the reverse.

Q. 144

Q. 144 1.38

as, and  
as I and  
as, and

The passage in the Quarto reads:

1.38 Ver.

But he plays'd himself

To try us with afflictions, but he will'd  
All kinds of sorrow, and shame on my bare head;  
Stung'd me in poverty, in the very lips,  
Shame is capitally, me and my hopes,  
I should have found in some part of my state  
A drop of pity; but alas,

It was in then:

1.40 Ver.

But he plays'd himself

To try us with afflictions, but they will'd  
All kind of sorrow, and shame on my bare head;  
Stung'd me in poverty in the very lips;  
Shame is capitally, as I and my slender hopes,  
I should have found in some place of my state  
A drop of pity. But alas,

(1.40-44)

Note the verbal differences: "Stung" for "he" (1.41), "sorrow" (quoted between "up" and "hopes" (1.44), "plays" for "part" (1.41) and (possibly a more polemic correction) "kind" for

---

<sup>1</sup>A partly falling upon quad.

Varian in Shilling (continued)

"kinder" (1.42). "Place" seems as much superior to "port" that one is tempted to postulate copy other than Quare. "Pound" on the other hand, although it seems to possess the authentic Shakespearean inflection, turns a postmaster into hammerer, a fact which, although hammerer was not unknown in Shakespeare, should raise no suspicion when a postmaster version is available.

The difference from the Quare punctuation was generally in the direction of more dropping and hamper stopping, which would not be surprising if I were using the Quare as copy, always agreeing that his practice in his two pages of James and Isabella is characteristic.

Again, the evidence seems inconclusive. To assert doubts on the basis of it whether the Quare employed any copy for the Folio or not. But even if it were not, there is no reason to suppose that the source in the corrected state indicated consultation of copy other than the Quare. In the first place, as we have seen repeatedly, and as Dr. Elton has also pointed out, there is nothing to indicate that copy was ever consulted by the proof-reader. In the second place, in this particular case, the most likely explanation of the error is that it was never suggested by the proof-reader at all, but that when, as he must have, he indicated the partly lacking space quad, I either mistook his instruction to be that he wished for a comma or decided to replace



Variants in *Shōjū* (continued)

the girl with a name as an easier alternative to either pushing it down or removing it and replacing it with another. A third alternative is, of course, that, his attention being called to the place, I decided there was opportunity for inserting a mark of punctuation had been noted and decided to remedy the error right.

7. *vyō*<sup>1</sup>(*shō*)*shō*  
Comp. 1

q. Shō 1.20

*shō*<sup>2</sup>  
*shō* a  
*shō* a

The passage reads in the *Shōjū*:

*Shō*. He called her *shō*<sup>3</sup> a beggar in his drink,  
Could not have laid such blame upon his Callot.

The third state of the *Shōjū* reads:

*Shō*. He call'd her *shō*: a beggar in his drink;  
Could not have laid such blame upon his Callot.

The uncorrected state had read:

*Shō*. He call'd her *shō* a beggar in his drink;  
Could not have laid such blame upon his Callot.

<sup>1</sup>This page is in three states. The second state incorporates all corrections except that line not corrected from "*shō* was" to "*shō* was" is merely taken. In state III this limit is corrected. (I, 315.) In state II "*shō*" (*shō*) has been corrected to "*shō*," the reading of the *Shōjū*. It may be, therefore, Dr. Hume suggests, that the change *shō*-*shō* represents no copy on the part of the *Shōjū* proof-reader. On the other hand he might be expected to suggest the change from "*shō*" to "*shō*" (I, 315), which, though also unnecessary, "probably represents nothing more than a misinterpretation and can hardly be taken as a further indication that not any possibly have been read against copy." (I, 315.)

<sup>2</sup>As *shō* is *shō*.

<sup>3</sup>As *shō* is *shō*.

Variant<sub>11</sub> in 22b11a (continued)

There is an apparent rationale for the colon after "drinks,"  
 It probably placed it there instead of after "where" through in-  
 attention. Now I could hardly have thought the change as im-  
 pertinent.

Had the proof-reader realized any the less change, it is dif-  
 ficult to understand why he did not delete the incorrect colon  
 as well as transfer the one from the Quote. On the other hand,  
 if he was going by the space rather than the copy he would  
 also expect its deletion.

There is, therefore, some slight possibility that both the re-  
 location of the colon after "drinks" to the Quote and the re-  
 location of the colon after "drinks" to the 22b11a represent a  
 tolerance of cryptologic punctuation or the use of a line under  
 the presumption of its suggestion of some degree of pause.

On the other hand, the reader may have called for the deletion  
 by indicating that it be transferred to the position after "where"  
 and I may have misinterpreted, as some were confused with similar  
 variants elsewhere, though on this particular page, which is in  
 three states, it is hard to see why an important distinction  
 should not have been again corrected.

ii.

iii

q 11 1.25

XXXXXX  
 XXXXXX  
 XXXXXX

Variants in Whille (continued)

The Quarto younger reader:

Ing. I pray you be content, tis but his honour,  
The business of the State does him offend,  
And he does this with you.

Eng. If I have no other,

I write a line:

Ing. I pray you be content: 'tis but this honour.  
The business of the State does him offend,

Eng. If I have no other,

Between the standing line and not removed it is hard to believe that the reader compiled copy here. There is an absorbing clause following "honour," and the use of the colon to herald this has already been noted.<sup>1</sup>

9. whil'd  
Comp. 2

Q. 22v. l. 12

I have laid  
I have, laid  
I have,<sup>2</sup> laid

The Quarto reader:

Eng. I have laid those shewes you bid me, on the bed.

The corrected Folio reader:

Eng. I have, laid those shewes you bid me on the bed.

In the corrected state the comma has evidently been explained by a space quad which took half.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 11, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> In taking space quad.

Verbalis is finally (continued)

There seems no likely justification for the comma and no one understood its deletion by the proofreader. If we look at the speech which precedes Bulfinch's we might receive a glimpse of what possibly prompted it's thinking of putting it there, though his actually doing so would suggest a failure to finish reading the line correctly, an unlikely possibility which I give for what it is worth.

In the quarto Bulfinch's speech which precedes Bulfinch's reads:

Bul. . . . my heart doth so approve him,  
That even his shiftness, his cheeks and brow,  
Produce upon me) some grace and favour in him.

Then Bulfinch's "I have," which begins the next line, might be taken to mean "I have approved you."

In the Folio the passage reads:

Bul. . . . my heart doth so approve him,  
That even his shiftness, his cheeks, his forehead,  
(Pythias replies me) have grace and favour.<sup>1</sup>

The parentheses show that it was recognized at the time of the line.<sup>2</sup> It has corrected the printed, which has been often noticed to show interrupted speech, to a comma (possibly adding a characteristic arbitrary verbal change from "and" to "his") and

<sup>1</sup>"in that" is omitted.

<sup>2</sup>Next says of the parentheses: ". . . which parentheses in French, the Latins call *interpunctio*: that is to say a putting between . . . the words in, to put each sentence in a writing as though he left out, and the rest of the matter remains a good sentence: and therefore it serveth well to be so used in these things. His answer is also, unnecessary to close the sense, which is set in the sentence, so as it be not closed thereby: therefore it appereth his sense to be so proper (For as) the closer, so for their *interpunctio*. Next, p. 165.

### Variant 1a Spolia (continued)

punctuated according to syntactic divisions rather than  
dramatically according to thought shifts in the mind of the  
poetess.

### Variant 1b

It, in the one variant in which he uses the copulative, followed  
copy punctuation. The proofreader changed the comma to a question mark,  
probably in consequence of his interpreting the quasi-rhetoric as having  
interrogative significance.

The variants of B's comma are solely of doubtful significance in-  
asmuch as other copy show the Quarta is often indicated. In the one ver-  
sion for a passage relating to the Poeta the reader has inserted a syntac-  
tically useful comma.

In variants 3, 4, 7, and 8 where B's punctuation, with nothing to  
recommend it, differs from the syntactically useful Quarta punctuation,  
the reader changed to punctuation identical with that of the Quarta.

In variants 5 and 6 the reader has anticipated his favored syman-  
tically sensitive comma respectively for B's comma, which is in accord  
with Quarta punctuation, and for his period, which is not.

Variant 4 shows signs of abbreviation and is difficult to correct.

### Variant 1c Line 1001

Line 1001 is thought to have been set from corrected copy of the  
first Quarta<sup>1</sup> called the First Full Quarta to distinguish it from the one

---

<sup>1</sup>Walt, R. M., First Folio, p. 373.

Variant in King Lear (continued)

originally dated 1485 which was actually printed in 1517) which itself has a peculiar character which has been studied at length by both Greg and Allen Walker. Greg suggests that the unusually contaminated text of the First Folio Quarto may indicate repair to a damaged manuscript;<sup>1</sup> this would explain why the text is very good in some places and extraordinarily bad in others. Allen Walker leans to the theory of a semi-literary manuscript.<sup>2</sup> An alternative theory is that the text in part was reconstructed from "sides,"<sup>3</sup> "sides," though there is no evidence that they existed as early,<sup>4</sup> would be copies of the "text" of an actor's part with only one word of the other players included.

Allen Walker studies the relationship between the various states of the Quarto and the Folio, but she considers "only some verbal variations" and ignores "differences in punctuation and spelling which belonged, I judge, rather to the province of the Folio compositor than the collector."<sup>5</sup> Also, her attitude towards the corrected state of a variant, that it has a higher authority than the uncorrected state, derives from an implied

<sup>1</sup>A suggestion privately made to Allen Walker. Walker, Textual Criticism, p. 38.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>As first suggested to me by Dr. John Kirk in conversation.

<sup>4</sup>Richard David, however, in the Annual Shakespeare Lectures of 1911 at the British Academy said of the text-sides, "We close our eye to the copying out of the individual actor's parts." Shakespeare in Shakespeare, British Academy Lectures, Edited by Peter Alexander, London, 1912.

<sup>5</sup>Walker, Textual Criticism, p. 38.

Varianza in Shin Jang (continued)

called in the proof-reader's having corrected copy to attain (3),<sup>1</sup> a point of view which must be reconsidered in view of the new light shed on the nature of proof-reading by the Wason collection, and, in the case of proof-reading, by our own study.

On the other hand, Ong's census of the Quarta varianza is invaluable to our study, and we shall use also as a point of departure his conclusions about which state of a variant the particular copy of the Quarta used by the Folio scribes showed.

Ong's conclusions about the probable state of each quire in the Quarta copy used for the Folio are:<sup>2</sup>

- 1 -- as variante
- 2 -- state unknown
- 3 -- corrected state
- 4 -- uncorrected state (1)
- 5 -- state unknown
- 6 -- uncorrected state (1)

<sup>1</sup>For example, the copy of the "1800 proof-reader" says "There is no reason for supposing that he was transcribing and such reason for crediting him with having done his best with very difficult copy." Idem, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>He gives his conclusions by the quire, inasmuch as a quire quire is made up of the eight pages of a single sheet all of which would therefore be expected to be in the same state. This is not, of course, true of the Folio showing; for example, page 82, pages 145 for 149, of Shakespeare's Hamlet's Tragic is in the uncorrected state in the original of the Folio (see, also, p. 144, Shakespeare's Hamlet's Tragic (both page 144 and 145 are numbered otherwise in the uncorrected form. It is the very thing in which they are variant.), and 150, p. 150, Shakespeare's Hamlet's Tragic, where the corrected state is the original of the Folio (see, also, p. 150, Idem, l. 150.).

Variables in the last (previous)

1. corrected state

2. or variable

3. uncorrected state

4. or variable<sup>1</sup>

Of the 167 variables in the Quarto (type shifts are not included in Berg's count), sixteen are uncorrected, 141 are substituted. Of the latter, there are sixteen punctuation variants, but none of them coincide with the punctuation variants in the Folio, though they have their own bearings and bearing or no study. The question of whether a particular page was in the corrected or uncorrected state in the Quarto is relevant in the case of Quarto page 41 1,78 for the bearing on the punctuation variant in the Folio page 41b11. At the same time it should now have to be stated not that we are at the lastest source from that point of relative variability of relationship between Quarto and Folio that provides in the unique case of house and falling.<sup>2</sup>

The following pages in the Folio last show punctuation variants:<sup>3</sup>

1. q32r(108) -- 1 -- not by 1

2. q35 (101) -- 1 -- not by 1

3. q36r(102) -- 1 -- not by 1

4. r11 (101) -- 1 -- not by 1

5. r12r(100) -- 1 -- part 1, partly 2, 3 not column 2

<sup>1</sup>Veru, W. V., The Variants in the First Quarto of *Hamlet*, A Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry (London, 1931), p. 48.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid p. 41.

<sup>3</sup>1, 108.



Verities in King Lear (continued)

6. not (104) → I → not by I
7. not (104) → I → "truly if not wholly I's word"
8. not (104) → I → not by I

1. qyle (104)  
long 8

$q^1$  at 1.20

invariant and  
constant, and  
verities, and

I list this down though it does not appear as a punctuation variant because I am accepting Dr. Kupper's analysis that it was intended as such but suppressed. His idea is that the reader wished the comma deleted, but that the compositor G, the king king added an "r" instead.

The whole passage reads in the Quarto:

Long. There be, as thy alligement bears wit  
Place thou hast sought to make us break our vow,  
Which we durst never per; and with stained pride,  
To cross between our husbands and our graves,  
Which was our nature nor our place can bear.  
Our prayers made good, take thy reward,  
Forth goes to dot all that the providence,  
To shield thee from dangers of the world,  
And on the fifth to turn thy hated back  
Upon our kingdom, all on the tenth day following,  
Thy lastest crutches be found in our dominions,  
The moment to thy death, even, by hiding  
This shall not be trouble.

King. My fare thee well king, mine thou thou wilt appear  
Forthwith mine heart, and hiding is here,

<sup>1</sup>King Lear, 1608 (First Folio Quarto), Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles  
no. 1, London: The Shakespeare Association and Gessner and Jackson,  
Ltd., 1911. This is the facsimile note from the Gessner copy of the  
First of Quarto which has been shown in the corrected state than any  
other.

Variancy in line long (continued)

The Folio (uncorrected) has:

- l. 21 long. Hence we surmount, we thin alliance leave us;  
That thou has sought to make us loathe and rue,  
Which we durst never yet, and with sinners'd pride,  
To open betwixt our nations, and our power,  
Which, nor our nations, nor our place nor hours;  
But potentia make good, take thy reward.  
Five days we do allow thee for provision,  
To shewd thou canst disburse of the world,  
And us the rest to turne thy hated trade  
From our blessings: if on the tenth day following,  
Thy banish'd troops be found in our dominions,  
We count in thy death, away. By himself.  
This shall not be revok'd.

- long. Fare thee well King, with thee thou wilt appear,  
Protest thou know, and banished in being

It will be noted that there are many differences in punctuation between the Quarto and the Folio printing aside from the one in the variant, but, most remarkably, there are a number of verbal differences.

1. the addition of "surmount," l. 21
2. "never" for "yet," l. 22
3. "sinners'd" for "sinners," l. 23
4. "betwixt" for "between," l. 24
5. "time" for "hour" (Q), l. 25
6. "what" for "with," l. 26
7. "disburse" for "disburse," l. 27
8. "Protest" for "Protest," l. 28

Dr. Blount has attributed the page to F though the long note has been attributed to Q, and since we could venture to state

Verdicts in King Lear (continued)

such as the suggestion that I would never have been guilty of its way and such verbal changes from copy as that suggest that the copy here was not the Quarto.

Even if we could presume to question Dr. Henson's attribution of the page to B, on the grounds perhaps that if the evidence were balanced between I and B, Dr. Henson's low opinion of I would cause his analysis of misdirection to be a misweight in favor of the page's being B's. Even though he does say that I also misdirects sometimes,<sup>1</sup> it is difficult to believe that even I could have been capable of all of the changes. Though the relation of a word and a word-change like "betwixt" for "between" are not inconsistent with I's work in Henry and Falstaff, it seems very unlikely that he would go as far as to change "four" to "five" and "fifth" to "sixth," which go beyond verbal changes and seem to suggest a substantive change in behalf of coincidence with some actual or supposed reality.<sup>2</sup> The most likely supposition, therefore, is that for this passage there was copy other than the Quarto.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> A specialist in the history of the custom of objection privately suggests that inasmuch as such determined the number of days' grace as suits are presented before turning answers into port (about the words varied with time and place), it was a less scruple in connection with Lear's work that style have prompted the change, though probably the temporary Elizabethan practice was considered rather than ancient British.

Variant in line 100 (continued)

The comma at the end of the speech more strongly suggests fallow-  
 ing to regulation copy than any other kind of comma, but the  
 Quarta has a period. Whether or not the comma is one of those  
 speculative stops in playhouse manuscripts to indicate telescoped  
 or interrupted speech<sup>1</sup> we cannot know. The other variant readings  
 are a matter of taste, but to my mind none of the Quarta readings  
 are slightly better. "Strained prior" makes more sense than  
 "strain'd prior" if it is to refer to an *apocryphal* place, namely  
 between "our sentence and our power," and, incidentally, "strained"  
 has more the sense of division than "strained" which has the more  
 singular sense of "strong"; "friendship" is more relevant than  
 "freedom," for our generally loose one's friends show one to  
 kindness, not one's liberty. But is there saying he no longer  
 has friends in the country since leave me all in all to him.  
 "Yeas," is the plural, matches "restorance," and the reader may  
 have connected it the plural for that reason. Elmsa has a lengthy  
 note on the variant, but does not make the issue of possible over-  
 Quarta copy.<sup>2</sup> He prefers the uncorrected reading, however, and

<sup>1</sup>See p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>[This variant] is of special interest--the same one, perhaps, be-  
 cause it has recently been discussed in print. Evidently a New England  
 copy of the Folio (the only copy, now in the Auckland Public Library)  
 contains the uncorrected state of *q12r*; and its reading in line 100, "Ye  
 come (strained not kindness, and our power," has prompted the annotated edi-  
 toring assertion that "the true reading of the line should be "restorance"  
 in the plural, and that the preference for the Quarta singular shown by  
 so many learned editors . . . should be abandoned." (P. Morgan, "The

Verdicts in sign. lang. (continued)

His suggestion of misperception is altogether plausible.

The relevance of the relative merits of the Quarto and the

Folio readings is, of course, again, why a manuscript of

inferior authority should have been preferred to the Quarto,

and if we are postulating other copy than the Quarto this ques-

tion is an important one to consider. If we consult ourselves of

sign. lang., 170, F.F., viii [141], 170-2). Now the author of this statement himself points out that "sentence" is the reading of the copy Q1, 170, where we find "The same between the sentence and the proof," and he also notes that "the shape of the line is more regular in the uncorrected than in the corrected state" of the Folio text. But "we must suppose," he feels, "that in the copy of Q1 used in the printing-house the two words 'sentence' and 'sentence' had been corrected (in manuscript, by an editor) to 'sentence' and 'sentence'; that the printer (i.e. the Folio compositor) had observed the first and larger correction, but had missed the small correction of the 's' in the second; and that the Folio compositor (i.e. the proof-reader), passing his eye down his copy and passing naturally as a line where there was a correction in his exemplar, picked up the change from singular to plural which his printer had missed. 'We must suppose, in other words, that the quarto's 'sentence' is wrong, that this error was corrected by an editor in the copy of the quarto that was used by Jaggard, that the Folio compositor nevertheless misperceived his copy and set 'sentence' again but that the Folio reader examined the copy when making his eye proof-sheet and that the corrected Folio text therefore preserves the true reading.

All this seems to me inconceivably improbable—the more especially because we cannot conceivably deny that "sentence" is positively satisfactory whereas "sentence" is inconceivably wrong. But how, then, did the misperception that we find in the Folio come about? We cannot be sure. Yet we may strongly suspect that our proof-reader, through some slipshod notion of what was being said, here quite unwittingly mistook "sentence" for "sentence." Or we may find an alternative explanation more attractive: that the reader simply called for the removal of the aforementioned comma after "sentence" in the original Folio setting but that Compositor E misread the *dele* sign and added an 's' instead of taking out the comma. In view of E's misperceptions elsewhere, this seems a distinct possibility. So the true explanation what it will, however, we can be sure that the later Folio reading is more corrupt than the earlier one that the change that was made by an some implicit reference to copy." I, 202-3.

Verbatim to Edw. Lear (continued)

an inferior manuscript being used when the Quarto was available, then we must concede that the changes were made by the compositor himself, i.e. B.

2. qqr(201)cd?  
Comp. B

A Mr 1-2

had,  
had,  
had.

The passage reads in the Quarto:

1-2 Edw. Was he not companion with the rascals knights,  
That looked upon my father?

Edm. I know not Halon, 'tis too bad, too bad.

Edw. Yes Halon, he was.

The Folio (uncorrected) reads:

1.10 Edw. Was he not companion with the rascals knights  
That looked upon my father?

Edm. I know not Halon, 'tis too bad, too bad.

Edw. Yes Halon, he was of that consort.

Again, we have a comma at the end of a speech, which in this case was regularized to a period in the corrected state. and again a case may be made for the following a telescoped or corrupted speech. Gloucester has answered Edgar's question with "I know not Halon." The "'tis too bad's are a general remark (or outcry) against the situation, Edgar's supposed attempt upon Gloucester's life. A few lines before he had said: "Fader my old heart be woe'd, be woe'd." (Q Mr 1-2) Edmund, too, is answering Edgar's question with "Yes Halon, he was." What more

Varia in King Lear (continued)

natural than that he should interrupt the action or speak simultaneously with it. Aside from the fact that the Quarto has a period where the uncorrected stage of the Folio has a comma, the verbal allusion of "of that concert" (1.50) also suggests additional copy to the Quarto, and, as with the comma, one might again perhaps suspect a playhouse rationale for the presence. It clarifies the connection between the Quarto's source and Folio's question for the benefit of an audience. But whether or not we accept the allusion as interpolated rather than authentic (and the two previous say, in Shakespeare's case, have been one) the suggestion is stronger that other copy had to be inserted or for it than that Cooper's I corrected II. If other copy was inserted in for "of that concert," then the presumption is strong that other copy than that known to have the period after "had" was used for 1.49 also. We cannot therefore pretend to say that Cooper's I carelessly changed a period, and a period at the end of a speech, at that, to a comma.

The importance of this point is, of course, obvious. We must attempt to discover where the balance of evidence falls on cases of inconsistent and irregular punctuation, open corruption of copy or open retention of copy. The legendary figure of the collator has been his own witness. A collator familiar with the regularizing practice of the Jaggard print shop in the matter of periods at the end of speeches would not have "corrected" the Quarto period to

Variantia in 1492-1493 (continued)

the owner of the manuscript copy from which he was correcting. If we accept the evidence at all, then he must have been instructed by Jaggard, unimpaired with the shop. Actually the degree of editorial function accepted by the compositor and the absence of any evidence to suggest that any corrections were made out of a disinterested acceptance of the desirability of fidelity to copy (when there is evidence of consultation of copy by the proof-reader, there is almost always strong evidence of the reader's being at a loss to supply something urgently needed, e.g., in the case of completely garbled text, in other words, when it was less trouble to find something already written than to write it correctly)<sup>1</sup> preclude us against the existence of such a person as a correcting officer. If there was no such person, we are left with two separate batches of copy, the Quarto and a manuscript, used either in turn or simultaneously by the compositor.

Thus B, tired and faithful to copy as he was, made some changes, a sign that he was required to and required to. The presumption is strong, then, that there would be no need for an after-visit later. The compositor might well have handled the coordination of the two sources of copy. Possibly not such coordination was

~~~~~

¹The notation of two lines on p. 45 in 1492-1493 II which were re-staged in the corrected state and the restored notation at the beginning of page 46 in 1492-1493 are worth in point. See Notes, pp. 247-48 and pp. 251-52.

Veranda in King Lear (continued)

manuscript, possibly the Quarto was used only where the manuscript was lacking. But if the composition did have something like a conglomerative function, it might explain why the appendix I seems not to have been treated with certain pages presumably containing manuscript copy.

In other words, doubt has been cast on the notion of a hand-corrected Quarto, unless we assume it to have a playhouse origin rather than a printers' one. The physical form which Mr. Hume envisions (the composition working from King Lear) may be deduced from his statement about 443-444, that "It may well enough have been corrected in manuscript in the copies of the quarto which was used by the Folio printer."¹ And yet the hypothesis is a troubling one in the context.

1.	512	Q ff. 1, 14
	three shotted hundred	
	three-shotted hundred ²	
	three-shotted hundred	

The passage in the Quarto reads:

good, shallow, biggerly, three shotted hundred
good, thirty shotted-hundred more, a fifty spore's
action taking more, a shotten glassingering
superficially more . . .

The corrected state of the Folio reads:

¹1, 512.

²As taking single-lined spore quad.

Varia in King Lear (continued)

. . . pond, shallow, beggily, three-must-
hundred pond, filthy mustel-abeeking house, a
lilly-blurred, astomewching, otherwise please
going super-sensationalist Hiccup! Toget, . . .

Inasmuch as there is that look like a unexplained leading space
quad between the second "d" of "swined" and the "h" of "hundred,"
it is difficult to know what exactly was in the compositor's mind
here. Nor is it possible to assert that the hyphen not in the
Quarto are all the compositor's own, inasmuch as "super-sensational-
istic Hiccup!" where the Quarto had "superficialist!" suggests other
copy than the Quarto. On the other hand, a likely possibility is
that the hyphen here is a result of mis correction; the printer-
reader might have asked only for the change from "swined" to
"swind" and the adjusting of the leading space quad.

4. qqr(110) all q the 14
 Comp. 8
 your lines, how else that station a/c/pian
 your lines, he dies that; a strides
 your lines, he dies that strides

The whole passage reads in the first state of the Folio:

Com. Thou'st paid upon your lines, he dies that; a
 strides/ againe, what is the matter?

The Folger First Folio No. 41 qqr is the actual proof-sheet
 for this page.¹ An examination of this sheet shows the delete sign
 in the margin and a blot over everything from the final "h" of

¹ A reproduction of this appears in "Back III: New Light on the
 Proof-Proofing for the First Folio of Shakespeare," by Charles Haines
 in Studies in Bibliography, III, 1958-59, 131.

Parsons in Line Day (continued)

"that" to the "at" ligature of "action," Brinkley, as we would expect, the reader wiped everything between "that" and "action" deleted, and took no notice of the correction. He did not stop to consider how it came to be there, and he took no care to restore it to the place for which the compositor might have intended it.¹

Both the comma after "lines" and the one after "again" are of the kind after strengthened to a conclusion by the Fells compositor. Either one may have been F's target, but transcription and mechanical error intervened. He surmised that when he corrected from proof page he never ventured further change not called for by the compositor, and so the correction was lost.

A. vi(28)42
Comp.2

Q. 24. 1.22

```
give . . . counsel, give
give . . . counsel, give
give . . . counsel give
```

The Quarto reader:

```
give a give was give then better counsel, give
we give again,
```

The corrected Fells reader:

```
give a witness give then better counsel give
we give again,
```

Dr. Wilson says:

¹This point is made to emphasize once more that the proof-reader did not stop to consider whether or not a point of punctuation was in the compositor's copy or not, but engaged both copy punctuation and Fells compositor's additional punctuation with the new transfer.

Variant in King Lear (continued)

In line 111 the comma after "somewhat" was probably inserted to make room for the addition of a new letter (the "s" of "glance"). There seems to perhaps not be any correction here, though there are clearly two paragons.¹

A glance at the corrected Folio page will confirm the stated condition of the line, though there is a bigger than ordinary space between the "s" of "glance" and the "s" of "that" which could have been deemed to make room for a comma on the line. Some work of punctuation is desirable from the point of view of operative mechanics, and it is almost inevitable for the printer-reader to have called for the separation.

6. mr10104ed
Comp.2

variant in 2

Folios
Folios,

The Quarto speech which corresponds to the one containing the variant in the Folio reads:

At 1.21 Lear. Some to speak with me, th' are sick, th' are weary,
They travel'd hard tonight, some lack sleep,
I the tongue of speech am flying off,
Fetch me a better manner.

The Folio speech reads:

Just- Some to speak with me?
They are sick, they are weary,
They have travel'd all the night? some lack sleep,
The tongue of speech am flying off.
Fetch me a better manner.

Again it looks as though either copy from the Quarto may have

¹2, 501.

Fortunate in Ying Yang (continued)

been used to supply "detacher" in place of the "fortifier" of the Quarter.

The detacher seems to be useful in separating "the images of revolt" from "detacher," with which it is in opposition.

P. reincarnation
Camp, II

Q. P. 1.1

the weaps,
the, weaps,
the weaps,

The passage reads in the Quarter:

... you think the weaps,
No, the weaps, I have full sense of weeping,
But this heart shall break, in a 100, thousand flowers
We are the weaps, O Forts I shall go out.
Revolts, detacher, Forts, and Forts.

The Folio (unreconstructed) reads:

... you think the, weaps,
No, the weaps, I have full sense of weeping.
Revolts and Forts
But this heart shall break in a hundred thousand flowers
We are the weaps; O Forts, I shall go on. / Revolts.

The addition of "Revolts and Forts" points to an additional source in the Quarter and its action strongly suggests a play-house manuscript.

"Flower" is an improvement over "flowers" (1.1) and might have resulted from compositorial correction, but it seems unlikely. The "detacher" direction, with the unreconstructed detacher, might simply have been confused to "detacher" by the Folio compositor. But that the compositor should have changed "Revolts and Forts" to

Verbalts to *Eng. lang.* (continued)

vidily inpridiblis. If the passage comes from playhouse manuscript, then no names will run the possibility that the name after "the" (110) might be directorial and suggest a person, for who or anything else of the kind that *Engage* and *Flattist* suggest.

1. *vid(100)u10*

Q 10 1,10

"vidily if not vidily
it's work"

skin, as the
skin, as the
skinner: 'the

The uncorrected state of the Quarto reads:

Eng. Then think'et 'tis work, that this resolution shewes
Loudly as to the skin, as tis to thee,
But where the greater vidily is first
The lesser is scarce felt, thou'et thou a heere,
But if thy flight lay toward the raging sea,
Thou'et most the heere it's worth, when the wind's free
The bottom delicates, the tempest is my skin

The corrected state of the Quarto reads:

Eng. Then think'et 'tis work, that this resolution shewes
Loudly as to the skin, as tis to thee,
But where the greater vidily is first
The lesser is scarce felt, thou'et thou a heere,
But if thy flight lay toward the raging sea
Thou'et most the heere it's worth, when the wind's free
The bottom delicates, this tempest is my skin

The uncorrected Folio reads:

Eng. Then think'et 'tis work that this resolution / shewes
Loudly as to the skin. as tis to thee,
But where the greater vidily is first,
The lesser is scarce felt. Thou'et thou a heere
But if thy flight lay toward the raging sea,
Thou'et most the heere it's worth, when the
wind's free,
The bottom delicates the tempest is my skin,

Variant is ling. lang (omitted)

It is one of the variant pages in the Quarto and quite it is the one about which they have differed uncertainty as to whether it was in the corrected, or the uncorrected state in the copy used by the Folio printers. The uncorrected state of the Quarto shows "unquestioned" where the corrected state has "unquestion" and the Folio has "unquestion."

Dr. Mann comments:

. . . the reader evidently meant a colon to be inserted after 'sine' in place of the period. The period was removed and the colon was inserted--but inserted in the wrong place. . . .

But again it seems doubtful that the Quarto was sole copy for the Folio, for "unquestion" in L.H. is not in either the corrected or the uncorrected state of the Quarto. It seems likely that the "unquestioned" of the uncorrected state of the Quarto represents underlining by the Quarto compositor of manuscript copy, and that the Quarto proof-reader supplied "unquestion" at a venture; there is little evidence to make us suppose that the Quarto proof-reader consulted copy that he corrected something unacceptable to something acceptable any more than the Folio proof-reader did. On the other hand, the change of "trailing" (L.H.) to "trailing" and, even more, the change of "the suspect," certainly acceptable, to "this suspect" (L.H.), does argue a change for no other reason

¹1. 318-11.

Veronica in King Lear (continued)

then to agree with copy. We must, therefore, suppose that the Quarto reader in this case did consult copy, had no better luck finding the manuscript than the compositor, supplied "unperturbed" out of his own head, and that the true reading is the one given in the Folio—"contentious." "Unperturbed" is certainly closer to it, but "contentious" would not easily have come to mind. It seems to keep in with the metaphor of an insular, but it is certainly not as obvious and redundant as using like "unperturbed state," of which Shakespeare, of course, could never have been guilty. Either it is a result of the reader's conscientious attention, in accord with his having changed "the" to "this" that he kept the "first" which might have been unobtainable, instead of writing "unperturbed," the ordinary form, or else the Quarto compositor misperceived the proof-reader's guess of "unperturbed."

In either case the presumption that the Quarto proof-reader consulted copy in order to change "unperturbed" stands, and shows both the Quarto compositor and the Quarto reader failed either to read or consult "contentious," we must suppose that compositor B would have failed also. The probability is high, therefore, that it would have been this or similar "contentious" rather than "unperturbed," the uncorrected state, not from "unperturbed," the corrected state of the Quarto, and that he must have had other copy than the Quarto. Moreover, we have for the first time a shade of evidence to support the usual supposition that the man-

Varia in King Lear (continued)

script the Folio printers had one difference from the one the Quarto printers had. Line 1 must probably have stood in illiterate style.

The relevance of what should be our principal concern here, the matter of punctuation, is, once again, that we cannot rule out the possibility that the period after "Woe," even with the lower case s following it, might have been F's copy, and if it was, that copy could not, as we have already argued, with any high degree of probability have been collated with the manuscript itself.

7.	all		q of 1.58
		there	
		there	
		there,	

We are still on the one variant page in the Quarto. The uncorrected Quarto reads:

all 1.24	. . . the trumpet is up mind
	Both from up whence take all feeling else
	None that knows their fillall ingratitude,
the 1.1	So is not as this world should know this hand
	For lifting foot to't, but I will punish none,

The corrected Quarto reads:

. . . this trumpet is up mind
Both from up whence take all feeling else
None that knows their fillall ingratitude,
So is not as this world should know this hand
For lifting foot to't, but I will punish none,

The Folio (revised) reads:

all	. . . the trumpet is up mind
	Both from up whence take all feeling else,
	None that knows there, fillall ingratitude,
	So is not as this world should know this hand
	For lifting foot to't: but I will punish none;

Varia in *Eng. Lang.* (continued)

"The Loopest" (L.44) agrees with the uncorrected state of the Quarto; "beates," with the corrected state. "tearing"¹ (L.34) agrees with the corrected state, "teyng," (L.34 of the Quarto). The evidence, therefore, points in two directions, showing the Quarto to have been a sole copy, but if we accept the chain of reasoning developed in connection with the previous variant on this page about "unconscionable," now copy may be indicated.

That weighs against the hypothesis of independent copy is the identical use of several spellings like "beates," but not, of course, against the possibility that the additional copy was the very manuscript from which the Quarto had been set.

In any case, in the phrase, "beates their fillfull ignorance," "their" would be assumed to be the possessive adjective, but if the compositor found "beates their" in his copy he would assume "thair" to be the adverb more normally spelled "there" and "fillfull" ignorance" to be in apposition with "what beates there." Without actually applying a comma he would improve on the copy by changing the spelling from "thair" to "there." Although the spelling of homonyms seems often indiscriminated in this period, the distinction between "their" and "thair" seems to have been observed very early.²

¹See above p. 115, variant 7.

²There in his manuscript of 1591 contains a right distinction

Verities in Hamlet (continued)

The proof-reader, upon seeing "beats there," continued the process of clarification by placing the comma in front of the appositive phrase.

Dr. Wilson suggests that what was wanted was period after "there"¹ implying that "filial ingratitude" goes with what follows. The upper case "T" might indicate a new sentence or it might merely be the capitalization common in the Folio for a vast assemblage of words. Actually it is a favorite trick of Shakespeare's, as well as of other Elizabethans,² to make a phrase do for the syntax of two different sentences, as, for example, " . . . now that beats there, filial ingratitude. Filial ingratitude is it not . . . " etc.

The comma then may not necessarily be a misdirection.

15.	16	Q. Qr. II.2 and 6
	filial/ ing	
	the, ing	
	the, ing	

between the spelling of the adjective and of the adverb. It is worthy of note that he not only always spells "their" but also "there" in his manuscript (p. 124) (though the printed versions have "there" and "there" (p. 127), possibly through some typographical scruple linked to a notion about their derivation from "they"). The homonymous adverb is invariably spelled "there," though variously "there" and "there" in compounds. Earl, *op. cit.*

¹q. vii.

²Dr. Wilson's analysis of James HEWLETT and of James's Psychology for Educators's Ing- in, however, James HEWLETT's Psychology for Educators's, 1907, p. 44.

Verdicts in Ship, Ship (continued)

A purely typographical error that need not detain us.

11. see(see(see¹(1.78) not in Q
 (comp. 3)
- this, looks
 this? looks

The corrected passage reads:

Do you see this? looks so her? looks her lips,
 looks there, looks there.

Since the uncorrected state had a comma in place of the question mark after "this," it is possible that the reader had asked for an interchange of the question mark after "her" and the comma after "this," but that only half the correction was effected. The other possibility is that the question mark after "her" has exclamatory significance rather than interrogative, but in that case it is difficult to see why the other comma have not been changed into wonder marks.

Since this is certainly not from Quarto copy and is, therefore, from copy unavailable to us, and since it is the compositor, there is no such *we* run, as is the way of postulating that the copy was like.

Summary/Comment

It is necessary to reiterate that in the case of Ship too many questions about the Ship texts intrude themselves between us and the

¹Fig. 11000, evidently counts lines whether printed or or sets up one which included only set-off lines of type.

Variant 10 (10a, 10b) (continued)

punctuation problem which concerns the compositor is make any very useful statements possible. But it is as of 10b as an even more obstructive variant than of the other plays. Most of that as we do at this point is to cite the relevant considerations as a prelude to future studies of 10b.

However, our study of the work of the proof-reader has profiled much from our study of 10b. We are confirmed once again the existence of his master's eye for syntactic punctuation and his consistent substitution of that which he approved.

In variant 1 it is almost certain that he called for the rephrasing of the syntactic error, though I miscorrected and kept it. In variant 1 the reader did the same and thus that I rephrased it, so as any should be look at the entire matter up and regard the error at the end of the speech as irregular, in which case the reader may have accurately be said to have regularized or normalized it.

In variants 6 and 7 the reader added a syntactically needed comma, as in variant 7 he rephrased an anti-syntactic one. In variant 6 he rephrased an anti-syntactic error. Variant 8 is obviously a miscorrection, as possibly variant 5 is also, but the reader probably intended to substitute a syntactically more suitable value for a period.

Variant 10 is a purely typographical correction.

Variant 11 shows once more the reader's desire to have a question mark follow a question, and he changes to it from a comma.

The reader is here, through all the variation and variation of copy

Verities in King Lear (continued)

text, running as true to form as in any other play. This is an important indication, then, that his aim would always be even; they were not dependent on copy, and he attempted to affect them wherever his nature.

CONCLUSION

It would be foolhardy to assert that each of what we have had to surmise as a working hypothesis in attempting to reach deductions in the case of any particular punctuation method is not subject to overthrow, for example, the nature of the copy, which has been taken from textual authority. Nor has it always been possible to propose variations of the authorized hypotheses even where our own work suggested that those hypotheses were unsatisfactory, since our own results might point in more than one direction at any one and the same time.

Yet a certain amount of progress has been made in assessing contemporary attitudes towards punctuation, at least on the part of our position and of general readers. This study has afforded us no direct evidence beyond the glosses that have always been vouchsafed to us about the attitude of writers, authors, or directors. If we may designate the playman-hypotheses, though we have a certain amount of negative evidence of relevance. We find, for example, that there is no evidence to rule out the possibility that the group-book or other copy originated in the playman employed punctuation for the purpose of indicating the relation of speech to action. Nor can we rule out the possibility that the author attempted to signal meaning and conveyed by signs by means of anti-systematic punctuation, and that some of these signals survived the affecting ministrations of the scribes, the amanuenses, and the correctors.

However, we have arrived on dryer ground for the consideration

of this possibility than any of the dramatic punctuation alterations ever stood on. For example, we do not lose our suspicion that a glass work of systematic punctuation may not have originated at the printer's in the 1590s hypothesis implied in the statement of Percy Simpson that "on any grounds that a careless or ignorant printer might have not stopp since the colon, perhaps saved his trouble; but would he insert them gratuitously for the fun of the thing?"² This conclusion of Simpson's in the direction of false punctuation is unnecessary. We find out from our study of the way both compositors II and III treated their copy in House and Jelling, the only play for which we are virtually certain that the Quarto was sole copy, that the reason change of all is the notation of a mark of punctuation, a fact which rules out the change of the difference either by copy or by punctuation in general.

And, on the other hand, Simpson's assumption that a compositor would not go out of his way to insert punctuation not already in his copy we have found to be wronged. In House and Jelling, it is the addition and alteration of punctuation marks which account for about 50 per cent of all punctuation changes. And though none of these were arbitrary and none for violating the principle of changes in almost all cases seems to be in the direction of underlining and underlining system. We fail to recognize in the practice of the false compositors or readers any tendency towards the use of any system outside of systematic emphasis, and there are signs even of a rather inflexible application of systematic

² Simpson, Punctuation-Punctuation, p. 8.

correction, for example, to the cautious use of the question mark. A tendency seems to be followed towards allowing phrases which are already used in *verbal* verbal, the small number of sentences testifies to that, but the work is often altered to one considered more suitable. And if we compare the explicit extracts of reliability with conventional extracts, as, for example, with the functions of particular marks of punctuation as delineated by a prescriptive sixteenth century handbook like Hart's, we find a varied similarity.

This need not surprise us, and it might not be apart the issue of the dramatic punctuation advocates. It is the very familiarity and acceptance and separation of syntactic punctuation which could give our scholars to the anti-syntactic. If Shakespeare chose to signal by notes of punctuation that the character had broken off in mid-sentence and resumed the action from a new point of view, and if he hoped to do this by notes of punctuation, it would only be because the use of a point would be abnormal in the circumstances that he could make use of it. In other words, the term "anti-syntactic punctuation" by itself fails to suggest that anti-syntactic punctuation if it is deliberately used must be anti-syntactic to be effective. And if it is anti-syntactic there must be a strong sense of syntactic punctuation for it to be clearly anti-syntactic. The practice of advocating the authorial use of anti-syntactic punctuation, therefore, demands the corollary acceptance of a well-understood syntactic basis of punctuation. It is odd that this has never been clearly realized by the dramatic punctuation advocates, but they are in luck, for the syntactic basis is surely there. Whether the authorial use of anti-syntactic

protection can ever be demonstrated as not tending to be seen. We have certainly not done so in this study. All we have demonstrated is that there is no evidence to rule the possibility out.

As for the directorial origin for asymptotic punctuation, though we have cited some of evidence for it, again we have insufficient evidence. Here, of course, the punctuation need not be strictly anti-syntactic; it would be sufficient for it to be observed, for example, a comma at the end of a speech instead of a period would call attention to the fact that the speech had not ended in the usual way. In other words, here it is not the thought or the system which has been broken in on by the character's own own idea, but an external agent has broken in upon the speech. But again we are far from either proving or disproving the very existence of such a thing.

What we have shown, I think, is that the probability of a printed mark of punctuation having been in the copy depends upon the character used. In the James and Julia pages set by E, for example, the number of lines which contain changes of any punctuation is not nearly seven per cent of the total. However, there is a strong consistency, the average percentage of changed lines in all five pages being about 22 per cent, and the deviation from this average never more than about 3 per cent above it, though it does go to about 5 per cent below it. In other words, the pattern of changes is not erratic. We do not find the low average due to the fact that on one page there is no change while on another everything is changed. We can therefore apply the overall probability with a certain degree of confidence to any particular case.

Therefore we can assume that in the case of 175 per cent of the lines we left intact, and on any way with some measure of confidence of any particular work of punctuation in B's printed page that the chances are at least three to one that in our B's line compared with and therefore that it was in his copy.

In B's case, on the other hand, if his two lines and falling pages are representative, the chances are actually against any given line's having its original punctuation. For again, if we can talk about consistency with only two sample pages, B's practice seems consistent; in each page he can be changed over half his lines.

To determine the probability that any particular work of punctuation was in a compositor's copy would be a little more complex, inasmuch as it would be a function not only of the number of lines he changed, but the number of changes he made per line, as well as the number of additions he made. But it is obvious that the evaluation of the probability that any given work was in copy is a statistical matter depending upon the compositor's practice.

On the other hand, the changes he made were mostly in the direction of improving upon the classification of syntax, so that if we find punctuation that is startlingly anti-syntactic, we might assume that either the compositor was careless or else that the punctuation in the copy was, as in 50 per cent of the cases, not changed. In a proof-reading page there is a further possible explanation, and that is that in re-setting the type a mechanical slip was made that resulted in a misconnection. In B's case it is possible to be proved that he punctuated from timidity

and failure to understand why certain corrections were desirable and need in places, but there is evidence that E, self-motivated as he seems to be, also sometimes misdirected, probably out of sheer unwillingness to take pains.

It that is it say, we have deliberately introduced into our data an unintentional factor and a sheer negligent factor and they both seem relatively small, for both E and E. This would show that the chances of a mark being noticed as introduced out of sheer carelessness is small. The relatively high incidence of such carelessness that has come to our attention, it should be pointed out, stems from the fact that we are now writing places that have been asked for correction, in other words, precisely places where we would expect to find them. That the wrong mark was introduced in the right place is harder to ascertain, but even though the case of E's failure to underline a name in a speech heading in his copy is a period and his substituting a colon instead is evidence that such a thing may happen, its having happened only once in our sample is evidence that it is probably rare. Of all the cases where a name appears in the quarto where the Folio would underline it a period, this is the only case in either E's first or E's two pages where it was not done. This suggests a very great attentiveness to copy. On the other hand there are several lapses. The neglect to place periods in the usual places after speech headings and stage directions where the copy was normalized averages about 1.2 per cent of the opportunities for negligence for E and 4.2 for E.¹

¹The particular negligent factor for each page might be used to give a more refined assessment for any particular page than a compositor's average negligence. It might be more tired during the setting of one page, for example, and the page, therefore, a little more carelessly set than usual.

Handwritten changes from copy on sight thus infer about a very small percentage of time. Incidentally, since R's and S's negligence factors are so similar, one might further argue that their very dissimilar percentages of changes from copy are the result of idiosyncratic policy and that S wishes to make very changes in accordance with some fixed habit of mind, while S in contrast with fewer changes.

The presumption is then strong that if a particular mark of punctuation is in an unexpected place, the compositor did not put it there deliberately. If it originated with them, they put it there unintentionally or through their habit of rarely expunging a mark of punctuation from a place where it appeared in copy. The chances are that it has undergone a interchange if it is on a 3 page, and that it is unchanged if it is on a 1 page, but there is at least as great a chance that the place had a mark of punctuation in it in copy so that the compositor placed it there through negligence.

To repeat, if a mark of punctuation appears in an unexpected place, the presumption of not having been in the copy is not unreasonable. Further than this no amount of proof is given. We need such case data of the kind uniquely afforded in the Folio by James and Jelling. And a further word of caution ought to be uttered at this point. We are generalizing from the practice of compositors with printed copy to their practice with all copy. It may be that they were much more careful with manuscript copy than with copy that had already been treated by one of their own brethren. It may be that if a mark of punctuation had been allowed to pass through one printing house a more conservative attitude with respect to expunging it

slingshot provided in the other printing house. Possibly the similar textual manuscript punctuation was less respectful. It is likely, however, that biases and characteristics of attitude towards punctuation are not easily altered with altered circumstances, and that, especially in the matter of the differences between the compositor and reader, these would tend to persist no matter what the nature of the copy.

Other conclusions are very possibly reasonable from the consideration of the typeset and setting pages and the fact that as many of P's pages were proof-read through neither of P's readers,¹ is that the compositor was expected to make changes in his copy. Not only was he expected to register lines according to typographical and formal standards, but he was expected to read and improve. For if the compositor had known that he was being proof-read for fidelity to copy, he would certainly not have felt it desirable to make all the changes he made. It seems obvious that what he was being proof-read for, was to see whether his page was acceptable in itself and whether or not it could be improved, according to the taste of his proof-reader. Fidelity to copy was certainly not the destination, nor the purpose of proof-reading, and the correction and improvement of copy was regarded as part of the compositor's function.

He might have provided a person intermediate between the Quarta copy and the Fella compositor who made the punctuation changes (as well as others) which at first is the uncorrected state of the Fella, but such

¹See above, p. 43, n. 3.

an assumption we contradict the evidence we have that *P*'s pages show a consistently different pattern from *P*'s. If they were each following copy altered by the same editor, this would not be true. As I have indicated elsewhere,¹ I believe the hypothetical collector where there is both printed and manuscript copy will also tend to be dissipated into the solid figure of the compositor himself when more evidence becomes available, but at this stage this can only be a hunch. At this stage it is demonstrable only that the editor of James and Julia is identifiable.

We must conclude that the compositor edited Quarto copy and was expected to do so. We must also conclude from our study of the plays in which there are proof-reader's corrections that he did not concern himself with this aspect of their work. In other words, the relationship of their version to the copy version was not within his province. All he concerned himself with was whether the compositor's version was acceptable or not.

It would be dangerous, as I have already indicated in another case² to extrapolate too far from the attitude towards Quarto copy to conclusions about manuscript copy, but we cannot will longer or further in attitude regarding such change as the proof-readers' case any more than in that of the compositor. As we have seen, in the proof-reader's treatment of James and the other plays with doubtful copy, in his treatment of James and Julia not altogether free from Quarto, and in his treatment of the plays not from manuscript, there are always the same

¹See p. 144.

²See p. 144.

operator. That he may be faced with the opposition of words that correlated from the normal usage, like that of a period after a speech heading, and the opposition of words whose conventional syntactic significance are incorporated with the lexical system of a sentence, notably, for example, in the matter of the presence and absence of the question mark. Neither of these concerns, it will be noted, seems in any way related to the clarification of meaning. They apply to precisely those cases where the meaning is as crystal clear that the work of punctuation serves a glaring lesser utility.

There are also cases where the system is sincere or ambiguous where the reader has made a choice of punctuation whose unequivocal conventional significance will narrow the intended reader of a particular meaning.

Both kinds of change result in keeping the customer happy, whereas the failure to change might have left him angry, perplexed, or resent. And both kinds of change eliminate possible meanings signalled by neither or directed.

It is likely that in a long running fashion, and certainly in a less thorough fashion, where they handled any more paper than the proof-reader ever saw, the compositors' conductors would generally be in the same direction as the proof-reader's, for the honor of the printing house rather than for the preservation of authorial intention. But a good deal must depend, as we have seen, on the differences in disposition among the compositors themselves.

In the case of *U*, for example, he comes off each letter from an

examination of his writing of Anna and Julia from the Quarta than he does in his relationship with the Peitz post-revlon. I must confess that I have considerably revised my opinion of his intelligence and skill after seeing the results of the Anna and Julia data. He seems to consider himself as judicious and, from his point of view, necessary changes. Some of his verbal associations are quite intelligent, for example Anna and Julia, "either" to "either", wife). He almost never introduces arbitrary changes, like F's change of character attributions, but that is outside the province of postulation change and we mention it only to urge that revision of F's reputation may be advisable. The importance of reconstructing F is not to clear his memory from stains, but to determine with the most probable accuracy to say deduced from his post, as well as the work of every other composer, the cleanness to say.

LIBRARY

LIST

Printed Facsimiles

Four Folios

Dr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. A
Facsimile Edition prepared by Ralph Rabeck. New Haven: Yale
University Press, 1955.

Quartos

London, First Quarto, 1611. Shakespeare's Quarto Facsimiles, No. 7.
With an introductory note by W. W. Greg. Oxford: University
Press, n.d.

London, Second Quarto, 1616-1619. Superseded in facsimile from
the copy in the Huntington Library. San Marino, California:
1916.

New York, 1619 (Third Quarto). Shakespeare's Quarto Facsimiles,
No. 1. London: The Shakespeare Association, and Longmans and
Jackson, Ltd., 1955.

Facsimiles

Obtain at the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C. 2

Henry VI, Part 1, 1612 Quarto (printed by W. W. for Thomas Low).
Folger Facsimiles, VI, 1913.

Shakespeare, 1611 Quarto (printed by W. W. for Thomas McKelip). Folger
Facsimiles, VI, 1913.

James and Julius, 1615 Quarto (printed for John Basketham).
Folger Facsimiles, VI, 1913.

James and Julius, 1615 Quarto (printed for Edward White). Folger
Facsimiles, VI, 1913.

Trilium and Crassida, 1615 Quarto (printed by G. W. for Richard
Lowen and Henry McKelip). Folger Facsimiles, VI, 1913.

BIBLIO

- Cooper, Charles. Spanish Teachers (1810-18). Edited by North Bailey. Local Studies in English, 1932. Lewis: C. W. B. Clarendon, 1935.
- Hayes, William. Spain, Spain, of Asturias. New York: Knickerbocker Books, 1919.
- Flather, Richard. Shakespeare's Prologues Used: A Study of the Origin of Shakespeare as he Appeared in the Public Hall. New York: U.S. Book Co. and Co., 1919.
- Gray, A. W. The Editorial Position in Shakespeare's A Survey of the First Edition of the 1616. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.
- _____. The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- _____. The Sources in the First Edition of 'True Love'. A Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry. Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, No. 25. London: Printed for the Bibliographical Society, University Press, Oxford, 1940 (Nov 1939).
- Hart, John. John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation 1551 and 1570: Part I. Orthographical and Etymological Pertinences. Texts and Latin Vocabulary. Edited by Peter Gaskell. Reprints of English Texts in English, 7. Rochester: Arno Press & Co., 1970.
- Hynes, Christine. The Printing and First-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Partridge, A. C. Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama: A Study of Orthographical Conventions, Etymology, Form and First-Reading. London: Hein Arnold, 1944.
- Stall, Edith Ross. "A Study in Wilson's Postulation." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, 1945.
- Stevens, Percy. Shakespearean Postulation. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Van Dug, Nathan. A. P. and Cornelia Staffol. Changes in English Printing 1467-1500 and Postulation 1500-1600. Bibliographical Pertinences, Part 7. Indianapolis: 1961.
- Wilson, Alice. Textual Problems of the First Folio. Shakespeare Studies, Vol. 1. Edited by J. Dover Wilson. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

Widdows, Edwin Elliott. The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespear.
1888.- Printed at the University for the Bibliographical Society,
1917.

INTRODUCTORY PREFACES

Brown, Frederic (ed.). Preface to The Dramatic Works of Thomas Shakspeare.
Cambridge: University Press, 1871.

Wilson, John Dover (ed.). Preface to The Tempest. The Works of Shakspeare.
Edited by Sir Arthur Collier-Croft and John Dover Wilson.
Cambridge: University Press, 1912.

Wright, Aldin and W. G. Clark (ed.). Preface to The Complete Shakspeare.
1882. London: Macmillan, 1913.

NOTES

Aldin, Edmund MacDonell. "The Preface to Shakspeare's Preface,"
ESQ. LXXII (1924), 217-219.

Berkib, James A. "Shakspeare Preface in the Theatre" See Johnson," ESQ.
LXXIII (1925), 149-150.

Brown, Frederic. "Some Relations of Bibliography to Editorial Problems,"
Studies in Bibliography. III (1918-1919), 37-61.

_____. "Texts" of Richard Farmer's Shakspeare's Preface. See
Library Bulletin. August, 1918, pp. 45-48.

David, Richard. "Shakspeare and the Players," in Studies in Shakspeare.
British Academy Lectures. Selected and introduced by Peter Alexander.
London: Oxford University Press, 1961, pp. 10-31.

Fries, Otto, G. "Shakspearian Preface," in Studies in Shakspeare.
Library and Drama. New York: Macmillan Co., 1923, pp. 42-44.

Grog, W. W. "An Elizabethan Printer and his Copy," Library. September,
1925, pp. 102-112.

Hansen, Clarence. "Part III: New Light on the Preface to the
First Folio of Shakspeare," Studies in Bibliography. III (1918-
1919), pp. 145-153.

Howe, Park. "Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century English Preface to
Shakspeare," Spanish Studies. XII, N. 3 (April, 1942), pp. 92-102.

- Sag, Walter, J., L.J. "Historical Backgrounds of Education and James
 Jean Functionless Theory," ESQ, LII (1946), 267-268.
- Stagg, Edith Stone. "William's Allegory, 41-55," ESQ, LXXII,
 No. 3 (February, 1945), p. 44.
- Williams, Philip. "Shakespeare's Twelfth and Coriolanus: Scholarship
 of Quere and Felle," Studies in Shakespeare, LII (1926-1931),
 171-243.

YES.

Miss Rose Hagg was born in New York City where she attended P.S. 5, Beaman Childs High School, and Hunter College. She did graduate work at Columbia University in Washington, D. C., and at Columbia University in New York. She received the Master of Arts degree from the University of Florida in 1948.

She has now returned to her home town where she is again at Hunter College, her alma mater.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of that committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate Council, and was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 12, 1961


Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Dean, Graduate School

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:



Chairman



